John Greenwood
Liverpool - Nicaragua
Xmas 1919

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/orderedlibertyor0000asdu

ORDERED LIBERTY

ORDERED LIBERTY

OR

AN ENGLISHMAN'S BELIEF IN HIS CHURCH

BEING THE HULSEAN LECTURES DELIVERED BEFORE THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE FOR 1916–1917

BY

A. S. DUNCAN-JONES, M.A.

PERPETUAL CURATE OF ST. MARY THE VIRGIN, PRIMROSE HILL
EXAMINING CHAPLAIN TO THE BISHOP OF LINCOLN
FORMERLY FELLOW AND DEAN OF GONVILLE AND CAIUS COLLEGE

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON
FOURTH AVENUE & 30TH STREET, NEW YORK
BOMBAY, CALCUTTA, AND MADRAS
1917

THIS PLEA FOR THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND,
THOUGH QUITE UNWORTHY OF IT OR OF THEM, IS
DEDICATED TO THE MEMORY OF

ANTHONY WILLIAM SCUDAMORE BROWN
JOHN WILLIAM REYNOLDS
AND
GEOFFREY PHILIP TREGELLES

WHO GAVE THEIR LIVES
FOR THEIR COUNTRY NOT THE LESS READILY
BECAUSE FOR THEM HER FUTURE WAS
BOUND UP WITH HER CHURCH

FOREWORD

THIS book, which is based upon the Hulsean Lectures for 1916–17, does not claim to be a work of learning or research. It is simply an attempt to indicate a point of view. For the former the exigencies of parochial work, especially in war-time, afford few opportunities, even were it within the writer's powers, while the latter may be assisted by those very circumstances which forbid the former. Religion is tested in the laboratory of the world, though its materials are discovered in worship and in study.

If there is anything of value in these pages, it comes from the great privileges which have been my good fortune. First and foremost my debt is to the University and to the College in which the greater part of my adult life has been passed. From this I learnt, and especially from him who was during my time a moving spirit in the one and the master spirit in the other, the inspiration that comes of loyalty to an institution, and the meaning of the "beloved community." The friendships of pupils and colleagues added to the debt, and especially one group of friends who felt as I did that their loyalty to their University and their respective Colleges was quickened and deepened by their belief in the Catholic Church, and especially in the

form of it which God's providence has given to the English people. In the service of one of its Bishops I have learnt to see that Catholicism is compatible with generosity, and Liberalism with a firm hold on Christian principles.

From the parishioners to whom it has been my privilege to minister in Norfolk and in Lincolnshire I have learnt the deep feeling for religion which exists in the hearts of English people, and that the Catholic Faith has a unique power of satisfying not hearts only, but heads too.

Finally, I have discovered at the Church of Our Lady by Primrose Hill that when the Church of England is allowed freely to express itself, and just itself, that it is a thing of austere and virile beauty, whose notes are joy and praise and hope.

All these things make me a debtor, the more conscious of the imperfections of what I have written, but the more desirous that it may, in a day of repining, assist the faith of some in the Mother of English institutions and the truest guide for English souls.

CONTENTS

PAGE

FOREWORD vii

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY: CHRISTIANITY AN ACTUAL AND DEVELOPING SOCIETY 1

CHAPTER II

PRIESTHOOD 17

CHAPTER III

NATIONALITY 49

CHAPTER IV

WISDOM 77

CHAPTER V

THE HOPE OF THE FUTURE 101

APPENDIX 129

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY: CHRISTIANITY AN ACTUAL AND DEVELOPING SOCIETY

"Christianity supplied the world with just what it needed to save it from retrogression. Its trumpet-call to a higher moral life rang out in the Name of one Almighty God, and provided that inspiration to fresh endeavour which could not be found elsewhere; it welcomed men to a religious fellowship which worshipped one holy moral God and claimed to have a special revelation of His will; it provided an atmosphere in which the religious life of man could develop along lines of wholesome progress; it commended itself by good works and the mutual love of its members; and it proved its claim to the possession of truth supernaturally communicated by pointing to its ancient origin, quite independent of Greek philosophy, and by appealing to the ancient scriptures of the mono-Yahwists and their fulfilment in Jesus the Messiah."—Hamilton, *The People of God*, vol. i, p. 184.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTORY: CHRISTIANITY AN ACTUAL AND DEVELOPING SOCIETY

To-day we are thinking of the future. There is a widespread and genuine wish that it may be better than the past. I stand here to plead with the affection of a son for his mother for an institution which I believe has an important part to play in the future not only of this country and empire but of the world. The Anglican communion has something to contribute to humanity, but there is one condition which must be fulfilled if that contribution is to be made, and that is that her children believe in her. For if they do not, who will? At this time there are many who criticise the Church, and quite recently that bishop [1] who, perhaps more than any other now living, represents what is most truly the spirit and temper of the Anglican communion, has startled us by the question: "Is the Church of England worth preserving?" He asks this because he knows there are forces at work which must, unless overruled by God, end in the destruction of the most remarkable experiment ever made by that strange combination

[1] Dr. Gore.

of sobriety and adventure which is the English spirit. It is an experiment so brave and wide that many of us do not hesitate to say that it is even more a product of the spirit of God.

In one sense these criticisms are nothing new, they are but the new forms assumed by old objections which have been heard for three hundred years and more. But the point at which affairs have arrived, and the development of certain movements of thought, make it peculiarly the duty of all Englishmen who care for religion to face the problems involved. Misunderstanding its own greatest achievements is apparently characteristic of our race, and it was not only the British empire that was achieved in a fit of absence of mind.

Certainly nothing has suffered so much from misunderstanding and misrepresentation, from the days of Elizabeth onwards, as the Englishman's church. Its survival, growth and development are, in the face of such difficulties, almost miraculous. Its history affords the surest ground of hope, for it suggests the guiding hand of God. Most wonderful of all is the way in which during the nineteenth century she has called out the devotion of those of her sons whose eyes were opened to her various beauties, and still more to attract to herself those who had been brought up in other systems. While we have to face the fact that, as has been shown by those unveilings which war brings, a large number of men who profess to belong to the church have not the smallest understanding of what is involved in her membership, at the same time the

devotion of those who rejoice that they are her sons, and even the half-conscious affection of many who appear to hold aloof altogether, combined with the attraction which she exercises upon outsiders, have to be reckoned in. They are grounds not of pride but of hope. Christianity is pre-eminently a religion of hope; it is firmly anchored in the future. But that hope is founded upon a faith which has its origins in the past.

The terrible events through which we are passing are making men look behind and before. They are asking themselves what is the cause of the present chaos? Is a law working through it? What will be its outcome? If these things bring progress, may it not be won at a less awful cost? And deep in thousands of hearts there is the intense conviction, which only increases and becomes more firm, that men were not made so to be; that wars are stupid. And this conviction is most strong amongst just those who have bravely accepted what seemed the will of God and borne and given the greatest sacrifices. They recognise that war is in many ways a purge, that it has called out epic virtues, and yet they refuse to acquiesce in the assumption that war must be. There never has been such a conviction that humanity is, according to the design of God, one great brotherhood. And yet those who believe this have to recognise that to many minds the valley of the shadow of death through which we are passing disproves the whole assumption. And they go on quite reasonably to deny the whole basis on which

such an assumption can permanently rest. To them the world seems plainly chaos, a struggle of jarring individuals and groups without any unifying principle. "This has exploded the idea of a Lord up there," said one munition worker to his mate the other day in the hearing of a friend of mine. "It has done for the parsons." And so those who believe that unity is the end of man will be compelled to look for a ground for their faith. And they will find it hard to discover one sufficiently compelling in those circular arguments by which the stoic, or his modern counterpart, seeks to establish the principle of human brotherhood. As they look around they will find two great ideas alive in the world, which seem to be sufficiently great in expression to act as the driving force of the ideal for which they long, and to turn it into faith.

One is socialism, the other is Christianity. Of each of these spiritual forces—for such, in their measure, they are—many hard things are said by those who have never troubled to understand them. Socialism from one standpoint is a spiritual thing, for it is the embodiment of a spiritual idea. It is intensely held by many, and enters as an ingredient into the dim aspirations of millions. Yet, after all, it is but a notion, the expression of a wish, the declaration of a hope. For what is the other ingredient? It is materialism. It is physical hunger. God forbid that I or any other Christian should do anything which seemed to fail to sympathise with the terrible and widespread

reality from which the movement springs, but I would ask all who are trying to get down to the deeper cause of things: Can you find here, or in this sphere, a sufficient basis for the unity of mankind? Man cannot live by bread alone. Nor can the mighty forces of this world ever be conquered by an idealism which finds its ultimate basis in the life that now is. The only hope of reformation is to be found in a firm faith that there is another force mightier and more real than the huge battalions of evil.

At a time like this many will surely feel that the inner springs must be in something that proceeds from the soul outwards. Man, who seems to be in the iron grip of a gigantic fate over which he has no control, will only find a redeemer from that fate in some power of greater majesty and demonstrated love. No notion, no hope will help him else. It is as he recognises this that he may turn to Christianity and ask what grounds it has to offer towards a faith in the two great needs of the human soul—a purpose running through the course of history and the unity of the human and divine.

This is not the time or place to show with any fulness how Christianity answers these questions, but two things meet the inquirer at once. One is that Christianity claims that there is a catholic church or common brotherhood for men, and the other that this brotherhood is founded upon the unity in diversity which is the Godhead itself. It claims to be a thing absolute and universal. The religion of one personal God who is made known

to us as the Father of all men, the Saviour and the Light of all men, the Holy Spirit who speaks to every man's conscience and binds all men in one. This, it claims, is revelation, the differentia between religion and philosophy. And this revelation is bound up with the history and experience of the Catholic Church. And that history is of vital importance to the true understanding of the revelation.

Here at once we encounter a difficulty. The modern mind desires what is actual, alive and moving. To it the past is a dead past, and, as for the dead, "let the dead bury their dead." The thing that has to find its support in history cannot be of present-day value. We are in the presence of a new "Aufklärung" of the multitude. Perhaps a new Lessing may arise to teach men the value of the accumulated experience of the ages. But if he does so he will have to deal first with that writer's thought that events of time cannot prove eternal truth.

In the days of Ruskin what was old was good. To-day what is old is in great danger of being out of date. We Christians have to insist that interest in the past is something more than archæology. It is true that the interest can only be justified in the long run, as shedding light on the present and the future, and this not only in the religious sphere. But a sound modernism must have roots. As Mr. Marvin[1] has said, "Metaphysics apart, we know in fact that 'thinking backward' has accom-

[1] *The Living Past*, by S. Marvin, Oxford, 1915, p. 3.

panied and inspired a new and passionate effort for 'living forward.'" Otherwise it has its only ground in the romanticism which desires relief from the actual.

But Christianity is committed to the past, because it believes one God to be at work, and still more because it believes that he revealed himself in one classical and critical way. The study of that way is not only an example to the individual but a luminous revelation of the real forces at work in the universe. These forces, it insists, offer a field for our co-operation. We can influence and be influenced by them. We can ally ourselves to good or ill, but ultimately there are mightier hands on the wheel, and it is because they have been there all the time that we believe in the Catholic Church.

Again, in religion history is of paramount importance because it is essentially a social force. In studying history we see, more than in most departments, that "things are what they are, and their consequences will be what they will be"; that "the child is father of the man." It is by a right instinct, then, that Christianity has always laid stress on the reality of the external world. There is a tendency in the modern mind to make religion more and more a subjective thing; the assumption being that that which is external to the individual is not so much wrong as useless. It is the cause of much that passes for mysticism, and is the great spring of all those endeavours to reduce Christianity to a spirit, of which the most

interesting example, because there is so much truth in it, is to be found in the writings of George Tyrrell, the most sensitive and subtle and sincere mind to face in recent years the great ultimate problems. We have more to learn from him than from most, but it is a grave understatement to say, as he does in *Lex Credendi*, that "it was the spirit rather than the body of New Testament Christianity that passed over to the Gentiles, and began there the work of leavening that great syncretism of all the religions of the empire into a vast catholic, world-embracing Church."

For Christianity shaped rather than leavened, and this it did just because it clung obstinately not to an idea or a spirit, but to facts. The dogmas of the creed are extraordinarily little metaphysical. But without them Christianity would have been dissolved into a mythology. They are definite, and that is what saved the Church in a world of change. As Tyrrell [1] himself has said, "If there had been no canonised immutable doctrine, no canonised interpretation, what would have happened to Christianity?" Priesthood is the element in religion which supports dogma and ritual, and in so doing it is bearing witness to the fact that the "gathered-up experience of others must be part of the ground of each man's religion," as it is of the development of science. It is only by the recognition of such an authority that we can be free of the doubts which cling to a mere persuasion and the hindrances which prevent its effec-

[1] *Life*, vol. ii, p. 218.

tive influence. Priesthood witnesses to the wholeness of the world and the unity of history. And most of all it is in Christianity, at any rate, the upholder of the truth that God is a great Actor as well as an ultimate Idea. It was revelation rather than illumination that formed both the creeds and the rites of the Church. And that this was not so much a leaven as a sword is seen in the history of the great Athanasius.

Priesthood, the belief in a holy people the guardians of the revelation of God who manifests himself in time is inherent in Christianity, not only since its own beginning, but as the very essence of that from which it sprang. The whole point of the Old Testament consists in this, that it is the work of a nation or group of people who claimed that they were a holy people, and that by belonging to their community a man was in living contact with the one personal God. The existence and unity of Israel was founded upon the unity of Jehovah, and was its proof.

There were two main elements in this religious expression, the one gathered round the thought of the temple sacrifices and the law, the other centred in the prophets, even when these two were opposed as rival forces. Yet it must be recognised that the prophets never ceased to be witnesses to the divine choice of Israel and the truth of the revelation God had made of himself in its history. And thus they were supporters of what we have defined as priesthood. It is sometimes thought that this way of looking at things was destroyed by Jesus. But

only by flying in the face of history can such a position be maintained. Jesus claimed to be the Messiah, or he did not. If he was the Messiah he accepted the priestly view of Israel. If he did not claim to be the Messiah, the whole gospel story becomes unintelligible. But granted that he expanded the teaching of the fatherhood of God, that he used language which suggested that his death applied to a wider Israel than he himself had known. Yet he kept close the connection between the unity of God and one group of people by his choice of his apostles and his use of the pregnant word Israel. He laid firmly the foundation of the new priesthood in the way in which he spoke about his own death. He extended and expanded a belief in God living and acting by his views of the Kingdom of Heaven. The apostles built on this foundation of belief in a new Israel, whose centre was one who had been on earth and would come again. And this preserved, and made dominant, the thought of God living and acting more than ever the prophets had done.

The new Israel consisted simply of those who looked for Jesus, and when this conception receded —it never disappeared—it was not transmuted into mere acceptance of propositions about the being and nature of God. It was always largely the recognition of certain acts and facts which were the pledge of a God who was perfect truth and love. It was just because God was, as it were, entangled in history that the Græco-Roman empire found in the Christian propaganda a deliverance

and salvation from philosophical abstraction and mythologising fairy tales. The contingency of God was proof of his reality. It also found a home for a spirit which was independent of all earthly governments, and cut across all barriers of place and race more completely than Mithras and the Great Mother, because it bound men into a very actual earthly society. Of all these things the Church, with its priesthood and creed, its sacred books and its rites, was the pledge and support. It is impossible to show the point at which the catholic idea took possession of Christianity, for recent research drives it back into the Gospels themselves, though it would be true to say that the seed is first sown in the story of Abraham. To give it up is simply to miss the point of the Bible.

The practical source of its dominance is to be found in the choice of the apostles. The growth of the pseudo-apostolic literature is a witness to their importance, and recent research only brings out what lies on the face of the New Testament—that the Christian community was never thought of as complete in itself apart from its apostolic founder or a representative of the missionary ministry.[1] It is true, thank God, that liberty and direct knowledge of God and equality are the ideals of the new Israel. But these things are only won through communion with that Israel, and of it the apostles are the foundation and the spinal cord. It is a failure fully to recognise this fact—I speak

[1] Cf. e.g. *Cambridge Mediæval History*, vol. i, chap. vi.

with bated breath—that lends a certain inadequacy to the great and honest work of Lightfoot on the Christian Ministry.

The Church grew out of and around the apostles. The old Israel was expanded into the new. The latter presents a religion even more mediatorial and objective than the former. The conception of the Church itself is of a priesthood of humanity, that has been and is kept alive by a priesthood within a priesthood, which is not so much one of power or government (though it is that), as a pledge of unity focusing union and guaranteeing a revelation. It is the prevalence of the idea that Christ and his apostles announced but did not make a brotherhood that has necessitated the insertion of this justification of the place of priesthood in Christianity. For if priesthood in Christianity is an error it would be vain to put it forward as part of the contribution of the Anglican communion.

Christianity was not individualistic liberalism touched with emotion. It was a religion which held an open door whereby a man might enter into the heavenly society, and that society had a concrete manifestation which was, to him who recognised the heavenly background, elect and precious. The essential element, the thing that made catholicism—that is, the concrete, complete and continuous embodiment of the super-sensuous home, the thing that bound men into one and wedded seen and unseen into a single law of love, the thing that made time real even while it staked all on eternity—was not the syncretism of Græco-oriental

religion, nor the organisation of the Roman empire, but the conviction that God had called into being a people for himself. The thought of Israel is the origin of the Christian conception of priesthood. It is found in the Old Testament in such words as: "Thus saith the Lord, who created thee, O Jacob, and who made thee, O Israel: fear not, for I have redeemed thee; I have called thee by my Name"; and in the New by sayings like "Ye have not chosen me, but I have chosen you."

CHAPTER II

PRIESTHOOD

"We condemn all secondary human mediators as injurious to the One, and shut our eyes to the indestructible fact of existing human mediation, which is to be found everywhere. But this last error can hardly be expelled till Protestantism unlearns the crazy horror of the idea of priesthood."—Hort, *Life and Letters*, vol. ii, p. 51.

CHAPTER II

PRIESTHOOD

The Anglican communion claims to possess priesthood. It claims, that is to say, to be a part of one holy people in whom is manifested the one living and active God who spake by the prophets, became Incarnate in Jesus and guides the course of the world. And I venture to think that the reason why it does so is that men may through this have a ground for believing that there are such things as revelation, unity and salvation. The English Church believes in priesthood because it is a necessary support to a reasonable faith which shall be akin to that of the apostles. The organisation of the Church, its ministry, its creed, its rites, are a proof that a man is not resting on groundless assurance, for it is based on "knowledge credibly transmitted by others whose experience may have been greater than our own." Before we bring evidence to show this, it is necessary to remember that there was, at the time of the Reformation, another theory as to the nature of religious assurance. According to Luther, its essence lay in the individual experience. It has been said of his movement, with truth, that it is "A Reformation

essentially in that every individual must re-interpret the Bible and the practices of the Church in his own spirit." [1] Luther made not man, but the individual, the measure of all things, and that individual was himself. To this even the Bible, which he wished in a kind of way to make the supreme authority, had to submit. His scholastic mind accepted the papal theory as a true statement of catholicism, but he opposed to it a theory, as unhistorical, which swept pope and bishops into the same condemnation. His wish was to restore the idea of the priesthood of the whole Christian people. The effect, however, was to transfer essential sacerdotal functions to the "godly prince," and, by so doing, to obliterate them.

On this he laid the foundation of a system which was to leave to the individual the utmost freedom as regards private religion, while it bound the Christian society hand and foot to the secular power. Calvin went along the opposite road, and wished to subordinate the secular power to that of the new church, which was established by his more logical mind entirely and legally upon the Bible. Both Luther and Calvin were intensely theoretical, with all the unreality which comes from an ignorance of history and a refusal to recognise the work of God in the development of Christianity. Each cut decisively loose from the religious system of his day, and rejected *in toto* the old ministry in all its forms. In many things the English reformers felt that Luther and Calvin

[1] Santayana, *Egotism in German Philosophy*, p. 26.

were right. They applauded their courage and their sincerity, they shared their desire to moralise religion, they adopted many of their thoughts. Of all these I shall speak more next time. But they were Englishmen, and were not then, any more than now, likely to be swept away by notions. They drank of their stream, but they did not regard it as the fountain head. It is important to remember that they understood perfectly what these reformers were doing, and, while they were aware of a spiritual kinship, they deliberately followed another course.

The argument even of Jewel betrays a very different standpoint. "Surely we have ever judged the Primitive Church of Christ's time, of the apostles and of the holy fathers, to be the Catholic Church. Neither make we doubt to name it Noe's Ark, Christ's spouse, the pillar and upholder of all truth, nor yet to fix therein the whole mean of our salvation."[1] This is to appeal to the authority of historical tradition. It does not elevate one man's feelings about religion into a universal schema, nor does it set the Bible in an entirely illogical position out of all relation to the history. The attitude which became typical of the best thought of the Church of England is movingly expressed in the words of Cranmer, when his mistakes were to be wiped out by a courageous martyrdom, while his great gifts were to remain as part of the tradition of the English Church. "I believe and I protest openly and confess that in all my doctrine and

[1] *Works*, Parker Society, vol. iii, p. 77.

preaching both of the Sacrament and of every important doctrine, whatever it be, I mean and judge these things as the Catholic Church and the most holy Fathers of old with one accord have meant and judged. But also I would gladly use the same words that they used, and not use any other words."

But the Reformation in England was mercifully the work of no one man. The spirit that inspired its great leaders was one which instinctively rejected the tyranny of the individualistic point of view. It was not merely academic. "Some things," says Hooker, "are so familiar and plain that truth from falsehood and good from evil is most easily discerned in them, even by men of no deep capacity." But while it did not despise the honest judgments of ordinary men, yet it recognised that other things there were which could only be determined by those who "spent their whole time principally in the study of things divine." The Anglican theologians did not differ from Luther or Calvin by a disbelief in private judgment, but they clearly and constantly took the line that the material on which judgment had to be exercised did not consist simply in the authority of the Bible, still less in merely internal individualistic experience, but that the interpretations of the fathers and the history of the actual Church had to be reckoned in.

Cranmer died with an appeal to a General Council on his lips. That meant that he wished the old Church reformed, and not a new one put in its

place. The English reformers believed that Israel was still Israel, though its rulers had gone astray, though the prophets might prophesy falsely, and the priests bear rule by their means. The actual facts support their claim and interpret their intention. Thus the English Reformation took its own course, and that course was unique in that it retained the element of priesthood, which I have been trying to explicate. It kept the sacred ministry and the ancient forms of worship, and it is a dangerous half-truth to assert of the English Reformation, at any rate, that its essence consisted in "emancipation from a sacerdotal conception of the ministry." [1] In fact, we can only regard it as coming from one to whom we might not unfairly apply his own words about another whom he has singled out as "remarkable for the crudity of his dogmatic habit and the brusqueness of his contempt for Anglican history."

We find ourselves in quite a different atmosphere when we turn to what is still the best general account of the Reformation in English. As the book is unfortunately hard to procure, I quote two passages from Charles Beard's Hibbert Lectures for 1883.

"When a laborious German compiler enumerates the English among the Reformed Churches which own a Genevan origin, and puts the Thirty-nine Articles, under the name of the *Confessio Anglicana*, side by side with the Helvetic and Belgic

[1] H. H. Henson, *The Reformation*, p. 25. Rees, London, 1915.

Confessions, an Anglican churchman, who is not angry, can only be amused. And in truth such a procedure is conspicuously unfaithful to historical fact. Lutheran, Calvinistic, perhaps even Zwinglian lines of influence upon the English Reformation may be traced without difficulty; but there was a native element stronger than any of these which at once assimilated them and gave its own character to the result. That after the lapse of three centuries and a half it is still possible to discuss whether the English Church is Protestant or Catholic, that characteristic parties within her pale eagerly claim one name and angrily repudiate the other, sufficiently shows that the Reformation in England followed no precedents, and was obedient only to its own law of development."—Page 300.

"We must take some pains to understand a fact which, more than any other, differentiates the English Reformation—I mean the continuity of the Anglican Church. There is no point at which it can be said, here the old Church ends, here the new begins. Are you inclined to take the Act of Supremacy at such a point? I have already shown that Henry's assumption of headship was but the last decisive act of a struggle which had been going on for almost five centuries. The retention of the Episcopate by the English reformers at once helped to preserve this continuity, and marked it in the distinctest way. I speak here as an historian, not as a theologian, and I have nothing to do with that doctrine of apostolical succession

which many churchmen hold, though the Articles do not teach and the Prayer Book only implies it. But it is an obvious historical fact that Parker was the successor of Augustine, just as clearly as Lanfranc and Becket."—Page 311.

Here speaks a mind which has all that sanity, sense of justice and sympathy which is so often to be found in Unitarians, and makes one wonder why their exclusion from religious consideration has been almost the only agreed point of Churchmen and Dissenters. There is something in this book much nearer to a true catholicism than can usually be discerned in orthodox protestantism. It would have been well, perhaps, if the Anglican divines had been able to revive more fully a corporate conception of the Church. It was the vision that danced before their eyes when they carried on the old tradition of appeal to a General Council. Such a thing was impossible at the time, and, meanwhile, they were prepared to cling like grim death to that episcopate which was the sign of the continuity of the English Church and the mark of its reformation.

It might have been thought it was not necessary to reassert the oft-told tale. As one looks at the long rows of the Library of Anglo-Catholic theology, to say nothing of the unwilling witness of the Parker Society, it might have been supposed that certain historic facts as to what the English Church claimed to be might have been regarded as generally agreed among scholars. But they have

suffered a wide but undeserved neglect even on the part of those who might be supposed to be their friends. And so when the Bishop of Oxford re-asserts in a more modern form, though in perhaps an over-conservative and too exigent spirit, the same principles, they are hailed as something new and strange, the fungus growth of an advanced extreme school that has lately sprung up amongst us. There is such a school, and I wish to speak of it presently, but the significant fact about it is that its opposition to Dr. Gore seems to be as keen, though less grotesque in its misrepresentations, as that which speaks in the words of Dr. Inge.[1] If it be true to say that the Bishop's book represents an attempt to take what he pleases from the Latin Church and reject the rest, it is equally true not only of the whole tradition of the Anglo-Catholic divines from Hooker to Liddon, but of the official action of the Church of England as deliberately expressed in her formularies and constitutions. The Dean seems suddenly to remember this when he suggests towards the close that we should have the courage to complete the emancipation which we almost won at the Reformation.

As a typical example of the tradition we may refer to the words of one of its ablest upholders and the shrewdest dealer with the Roman claims, Bishop Bramhall. In treating of the question whether the Church of Rome be a true Church, and whether we have departed from it in essentials, he begins his discussion by asserting, "I answer

[1] Cf. The *Guardian*, Oct. 26, 1916.

negatively, We have not." On this point of fact we shall find a juster view than Dr. Inge's if we turn from the theologian to the historian. It is an acute and learned writer of our own university—Mr. G. M. Trevelyan in his *England under the Stuarts*—who speaks as follows of the episcopate in the seventeenth century. "Pym differed from Digby and Falkland because he foresaw that nothing short of the abolition of the office itself would be more than a temporary safeguard against the revival of Ritualism in the bosom of the English Church. The office and tradition of a bishop are inextricably associated with the Catholic conception of the Church."

Exactly, the Reformation in England followed a different course from that taken anywhere else, save perhaps in Sweden. It was really a reformation, a clearing away of older growths from the strong old tree. It was not a revolution. To quote Bishop Bramhall again: "If weeds be of the essence of a garden, then indeed we have forsaken the Roman Church in essentials, otherwise not." The outward proof of this continuity of essence was always found in the succession of the bishops, and that this has been the steady tradition of the Church of England is proved by Dr. A. J. Mason in his recent book, *The Church of England and Episcopacy*.

There is some truth in the assertion that the Church of England has tended to identify the Church and the ministry too much. Its opposition to the Papacy shared something of the mediæval

view which it opposed, and this standpoint has been carried over into modern times by its insistence on episcopacy as a form of government. Such an emphasis was natural to the seventeenth century, which, faced by the anarchism which seemed to open up as a consequence of the Reformation and Renaissance, was chiefly interested in forms of government.

It was carried so far, indeed, that episcopacy was supported not only as a way of governing the Church but also as upholding government from above in the State, a point of view which was crystallised in the saying of James I: "No Bishop, No King," and is responsible for a close and disastrous association—as, for example, by Laud—of the ancient order of the Church with the divine right of kings. The strange result of this is that it is a question whether Laud died for the Church or for his conception of the State; while there is no reasonable doubt that Charles, at the last, died because he adhered to the primitive view of the Church rather than for his notions as to the right regimen of the State. Charles died for the episcopate and the Prayer Book, and so in the main did Laud. They were by the consent of dispassionate judges as clear in their rejection of the Roman theory and practice as Dr. Gore. By their deaths they gave an element of romance to the Church of England which, save for Cranmer and his fellow-martyrs, it had lacked since the days of Becket.

From that time onwards she has never failed of devout sons who saw in the episcopate the pledge

of continuity—a concrete reality expressing a spiritual vision, which is the historic Church. It is still spoken of too much as a divinely inspired form of government, but we might interpret the assertion by saying that it is a pledge, an outward and visible sign, a concrete symbol of God guiding the course of a new Israel in the actual experience of history. This value remains while the insistence upon the episcopate as a monarchical form of government will not bear examination.

For, as a matter of fact, the theory of the monarchical episcopate has not produced such a good form of government in this country, and if anything could have upset the faith of the Anglo-Catholics it would have been the failure of the bishops. This failure has been due partly to the kind of men who have been elected for the office, partly to the fact that they have attempted to govern unconstitutionally and without consultation with the sacred synod, and, we ought to add, the faithful laity. They have failed in the past because they claimed they were a kind of junta, or that each is a pope in his own diocese, or that they must elevate the Archbishop of Canterbury into a kind of *papa alterius orbis.*

But we may well believe that these traces of mediævalism are the growing pains of something which is working towards a Christian government of living reality. It is pathetic but stimulating to any one who cares for principles to see how the main body of Anglican feeling has always stuck to the episcopate as a guarantee which assured them

of the reasonableness and rightness of their position as members of that body, while the holders of the office have so often shown themselves incapable of understanding the *raison d'être* of their own existence. Such a position is seen in the scathing letters of William Law to Hoadley and in the demands of the first of the *Tracts for the Times:* "Hitherto you have been upheld by your birth, or education, or wealth, or connections. Should these secular advantages cease, on what must Christ's ministers depend?" And such an instinctive drawing towards first principles may be seen in the disturbance about the Conference at Kikuyu.

One of the dangers which is always facing the Anglican communion is that of losing its essential character and being submerged in the general stream of Protestantism. There were two elements in the opposition to Kikuyu. One was what can only be called a deliberate attempt to wreck the church on the part of a small body of people who thought they discerned in this incident their opportunity. They did not really believe in the Church of England, but only in a certain conception of Catholicism which they were endeavouring to foist upon her, a conception which was alien to her genius. But far the larger part of the opposition came from that unorganised and rather vague but definitely loyal body of priests and laity who felt instinctively that a vital nerve was being attacked. They knew quite well that there was another group of men and women, small but keen, who were determined on melting the distinctive character-

istics of their communion into "the shapeless chaos of indefinite Protestantism." [1] This latter group felt no anxiety lest their actions should destroy the English Church. They were, and are, set on intercommunion with Protestants at all costs.

Those who opposed the Kikuyu proposals were often wrong in their arguments, timid in their outlook, harsh in their prejudices, and yet underneath them they represented the main body of the Church and the historic Anglican tradition. They were entirely out of sympathy with the scholastic line adopted by the Bishop of Zanzibar. But it was a popular and instinctive movement which represented the old tradition and felt strongly that "the Ark" was in danger. It is easy to laugh at them, it is easy to confuse them with the smaller group to which I have referred—those who definitely wish to bring the Church of England to an end. But a patient examination of the case shows, I venture to think, how much they had on their side. Just as before the outbreak of a war instinct tells the people that their national existence is threatened by some apparently trifling occurrence, so these men felt that a threat was being made against that essence of the Church of England, to which they owed the truest loyalty. And what contributed more than anything else to their uneasiness was a profound distrust of their leaders. This distrust had old roots, which must be referred to.

If the history of the nineteenth century be considered, one outstanding fact cannot be missed.

[1] The phrase is Alexander Knox's.

A great movement was welling up to give life to bones even friends thought dead. There was nothing quite comparable to it in any European country. Its main characteristic lay in this fact, that it was an appeal to a society to act up to what it professed, to obey its own laws; in a word, to believe in itself. Roughly speaking, this movement was regarded by the bishops with constant suspicion, for indeed they were strangely ignorant of the motives and aims of those who were pushing forward. It was always the ritualists who were charged against. It was always the ritualists who were treated as disloyal, though they turned aside for a moment to condemn "Essays and Reviews." The facts of the story are fairly told by Mr. Warre Cornish, and the almost complete lack of sympathetic understanding displayed in the book makes it all the more valuable, for the mind of the author is symptomatic of the rest of the ruling class of the nineteenth century—the type appealed to with almost hieratic devotion as "the layman."

The shifts resorted to by those in authority seem to us now ridiculous, but unfortunately they have lowered the moral atmosphere of the Church and erected a barrier of suspicion and soreness between bishops and clergy which it will take years to break down. For, broadly speaking, the net effect produced on the minds of those who were in this movement was that they could not expect fair treatment from their Fathers in God. And until this result is fairly faced we cannot hope to understand the very serious situation in which we find

ourselves to-day. For unfairness has bred unfairness, and while those who have sown have passed away, the crop has yet to be reaped in its entirety.

The Oxford movement made a change not so much in the theory of the Church as in its practice. The leaders of the movement have often been reproached because they made no original contribution to thought. They would have accepted the charge as a compliment, for nothing was farther from their intentions and wishes, for what they taught was to them part of the regular "orthodox" tradition. The difference was that they insisted that it should come down from the realm of theory into actual life. They said: "If there are fasts, let us fast; if there are bishops, let them be bishops. If we teach that the child is joined to the Body of Christ in baptism, let us teach him to believe in that inspiring truth and to love it."

The journey to the Mediterranean which Newman and Hurrell Froude undertook was one cause of the movement. It was, at any rate, symbolic of its spirit, for they discovered that Catholicism was an actual living thing. They saw with their own eyes the devotion of the multitudes, they felt the fervour of their faith, they recognised some things akin to themselves, and others that were strange, and they asked themselves unceasingly and unsparingly why it was that they, who professed the same faith, held the same supernatural view of the Sacraments, retained the same ancient priesthood, yet entirely lacked this fervid, heaven-aspiring life. The difference, they declared, was

simply due to the fact that the leaders of our church had forgotten their first principles. They returned with that strange exaltation which comes from the acceptance of a great adventure, the endeavour to make the Church of England believe with the heart what it confesses with the lips. They were audacious, and they despised convention; they had clear principles; they were entirely unofficial. "Let us tell the truth and shame the devil. Let us give up a national church and have a real one," said Hurrell Froude.

But most of all they appealed to arguments and principles deeply embedded in the institution which they wished to reform. Without this all the rest would have been hopeless. It would have been the history of Wesley over again. Keble and Pusey reformed the Church where Wesley only created a schism, because the former founded their arguments on the firm basis of objective fact and history, while the latter had only his own inner consciousness for guide. The Catholic revival succeeded, because it was germane to the institution to which it brought life, whereas the other represented alien principles.

At its start it was a great challenge to authority. It was necessary that it should be so. But it has not been an advantage that it should permanently take on that character. Christianity is a warfare, but it is not good for it always to be internecine. The official mind took fright eighty years ago, and has never quite recovered. We live in happier and wiser times to-day, but the trail of mutual sus-

picion is over the whole Church still. Nor will it be purged till repentance has been done for the refusal to recognise the appeal where it was true. The horizon is more hopeful just from the very fact that this repentance has been begun. One sign of it is the Report of the Sub-committee of the Upper House of the Convocation of Canterbury on the Ornaments of the Church and its ministers.

The Ornaments rubric was one of the clearest proofs of the reiterated intention of the Anglican reformers to preserve continuity with the ancient Church even in outward things. This was quite plain, whether the reference was to the First Prayer Book or to the general state of things existing in the second year of Edward's reign. But when the Courts of Law decided that it meant the exact opposite of what it said, and when the whole weight of the episcopal bench was employed to uphold a conclusion revolting to common sense and common honesty, small wonder that the plain man was driven into an extreme, intransigeant attitude, and indoctrinated with a profound suspicion of the minds and methods of bishops. To many it seemed that the Church was hopelessly entangled in extraneous influences by its confusion with a system of law capable of producing such flagitious judgments and an episcopate whose entire appointment rested in the hands of a political leader.

There are some arguments in favour of the State appointment of bishops, but those who uphold the practice must, at any rate, reckon with this fact: At the present time, and in spite of a great change

of mind in the episcopate, large sections of the clergy look upon a bishop with mistrust. The natural instinct of the politician is to secure a man who will preserve peace. Troubles in the Church are an annoyance to the State, and especially troubles which spring from the assertion that the Church has an authority "derived from sources unknown to the Constitution." [1]

A politician looks to numbers rather than to principles, and so has a sound instinct for a safe man, who will compromise rather than comprehend. It is this political spirit which has played a large part. It had to deal with a movement which challenged not only the conventions which had grown up in the Church, but the whole theory of its relation to the State. But politics have a poor chance where principles are concerned, and pacifism is the best ally of militarism, whether it be in Church or State. Fortunately, the Church of England produced two great Christian men, who were at once the first ministers of the Crown and also statesmen. Gladstone and Salisbury did a work for English Christianity which we should never forget. But in spite of them the net result of the system was to produce bishops who, by lack of sympathy and knowledge, have been led into action which was really unjust. It is largely for this reason that a movement which was ardently and profoundly loyal to the Church of England is in some danger of degenerating into a gang of conspirators organised for its destruction, and amongst

[1] H. H. Henson, *The National Church*, p. 117.

those who claim the Catholic tradition it has produced one group that is proud to call itself the "Bishops' Ulster."

The men of the Catholic Revival claimed that the Church of England was a part of the actual existing Catholic Church, just as Bramhall and the great men of the seventeenth century had done. They found their justification in her organisation, her forms of worship and the tradition of her divines. They demanded that her teaching should be put into practice. It was by a natural logic that the Oxford movement became the ritualist movement. These men were Englishmen, and they knew that their countrymen were much more influenced by the concrete than by the abstract. That is why, ever since the sixteenth century, troubles within the Church of England have had a vestiarian aspect. It may be, as Creighton used to affirm, that an Englishman hates an idea, but surely it would be truer still to say that he is wisely uninterested in notions that do not find outward expression. The whole ritualist controversy has been quite unfairly laughed at as an affair of clothes by people who were all the time thoroughly determined to stick to those to which they were accustomed. Yet both parties were quite right to care intensely, for there was a principle underlying the observance or non-observance of the Ornaments rubric. For the former meant not any special eucharistic doctrine, as was mistakenly believed by some on both sides, but the assertion that there was an Israel of God throughout the centuries, and that we

belonged to it. Its deliberate non-observance meant that we were a Protestant association whose real basis was the Establishment, only distinguished from other Protestant bodies by the odd eccentricity of having bishops, a fixed liturgy, and an unattractive sense of social superiority.

The ritualist movement was a difficult one to handle because from the first it really did contain the seeds of the idea that Rome was the standard and ideal, though its main solidity and strength came from its appeal to the past history of the Church of England, and a deep impregnation with the teaching of the ancient fathers. But there were others like Newman, whose religion was really individualist, and to whom his personal state meant more than all history. When the mind of the Church of England at the moment seemed against him, his sensitive soul fled for refuge to Rome. It is a commonplace to observe how profound an influence he had on the Church he left. But there was another man, quite different in temper, who was the seed, or at any rate the symptom, of much that has happened since. W. G. Ward deliberately started out with an "ideal" of what was Catholic—a thing *totus teres atque rotundus*—in his mind, and because the Church of England could not be fitted into it, it was condemned.

Ever since there have been two schools of thought within the movement, the one resting on history, tradition and fact, as did Keble and Pusey, the other starting with an ideal, which was as notional

and speculative as that which the English Church had steadily refused to absorb. The Ward type of mind is with us still. It has been perfectly summed up by R. W. Church. "The Anglican writers had drawn their ideas and their inspiration from the Fathers; *the Fathers lived long ago*,[1] and the teaching drawn from them, however spiritual and lofty, wanted the modern look, and seemed to recognise insufficiently modern needs. The Roman applications of the same principles were definite and practical, and Mr. Ward's mind, essentially one of his own century, and little alive to what touched more imaginative and sensitive minds, turned at once to Roman sources for the interpretation of what was Catholic."[2]

The position was complicated still further when the movement went out into the world. Revival of worship became its main interest. Its supporters felt with their whole souls that what men had forgotten was the objective reality of God as revealed in the history of His Church. They had an intense belief in the Divine Sacrifice and in that consecration of matter, the body, and outward things which flowed from the Incarnation. They revived the sense that worship, being a form of love, was worth doing for its own sake, and in the Prayer Book they found an expression of it which belonged to the old and Catholic family, in spite of the somewhat chequered history through which it had passed.

But the question arose: "How were the old

[1] The italics are mine. [2] Church, *Oxford Movement*, p. 305.

beauty and dignity to be revived?" The two strains at work revealed themselves. The majority were genuine Anglo-Catholics, and the more thoughtful of them stuck to the tradition, and looked to the past for their principles. The more reckless—the "Wardians"—who had no interest in history and not much in art, seized on the point that Rome is Catholic, Rome has preserved Catholic worship. They had a vague, mistaken idea that her practices were everywhere uniform. So they just went to France and Belgium and copied what they saw. It was a period when the Roman Church, naturally a conservative body, was still passing through the heyday of "eighteenth-century bad taste."[1] The adoption of this ceremonial thus added to the necessary difficulty of strangeness the two further hindrances that it was frankly borrowed from Rome, and that it was hideous. At the same time a new notion had been subtly, almost unconsciously, introduced—the notion that Rome was the true ideal of Catholicism.

And yet the enormous majority of the innovators were absolutely loyal in intention. They were not always clever at explaining themselves. But they were standing for a great thing, a thing which had, theologically and historically, an enormously strong position. The men in power, however, lacked just that knowledge which would have enabled them to pierce beneath the ritualists' wooden way of stating their position to the deep and permanent realities of the human soul which

[1] Cf. Adrian Fortescue, *The Vestments of the Roman Rite*, p. 22.

were underneath. It is a most unfortunate thing that a knowledge of theology and ecclesiastical history, and especially of the science and art of liturgy would seem to have been regarded as disqualifications for the episcopate. Even the most convinced lover of the amateur might have seen that the faults of the ecclesiastic are less harmful to the bishop's office than those of the schoolmaster, the don, or the popular preacher. Benson was in many ways a better archbishop than his predecessor or successor. He had been a schoolmaster, but he was first of all a priest.

There is wisdom in the words of Pascal. To put one's hope in ceremonies is to be superstitious, but to refuse to submit to them is pride. A church which claims to be learned might have trusted learning in this sphere too, and found it the best foe of folly and extravagance after all.

The fact remains that the power to distinguish the loyal from the disloyal, that which was founded upon history and that which was deduced from theory, was strangely lacking. This was made the more unfortunate because while many were driven to despair of the bishops, and to tend more and more towards Roman methods, there was also growing up a body of opinion patient, learned, laborious and loyal, which did not attempt to fit the Prayer Book mass either into the Roman or the Sarum rite, but accepted it as it was, only desiring to clothe it reasonably with that beauty and honour which it would bear. For their sources they went to those "times past" to which the Prayer Book

itself refers, and which, as scholars were beginning to discover, had, as far as the great rite of Christendom was concerned, added very little which could be called abuse.

Two examples of this lack of understanding may be quoted, and they are the more telling because the two men chosen were good and honest men, with very high claims to our respect. One is Archbishop Temple, and his handling of the question of incense. Here was something which might quite fairly be held to be covered by the Ornaments rubric, since the time for its ministration still existed. It was a thing perfectly innocent in itself. Its symbolism was so vague that no one with any knowledge would suggest that any definitely Roman doctrine was indicated by its use. Indeed, it was desired because its use as an adjunct of worship throughout the historic churches of Christendom was so ancient and universal that when the Nestorians, to whom the Archbishop's mission went, heard that we did not employ it, they surmised that it must be due to the Pope, whom they knew to have exercised a malign influence in England. Yet it was held by the Archbishop to be a thing of so great an importance that it changed the general character and aspect of the service. It was excluded on the ground that it was not a ceremony ordered in the book, a highly disputable proposition. This negative and legal view of the rubrics, which breathed the atmosphere of the Tudors where anything additional was concerned, was combined with the amazing statement that neglect to carry

out positive requirements was not of the same importance, because the individuals who made these omissions did not claim that they had the authority of the Catholic Church for so doing.[1]

The strange contention that you must not introduce anything fresh because other Christians do it, while it does not matter that you neglect to carry out the things you are ordered and have sworn to do, as long as you only claim your private fancy as your guide, cut at the roots of corporate loyalty in the Church of England. The situation was only made worse when the Archbishop showed more plainly how far prejudice would carry him by saying that it was allowable to dilute the wine in the Sacrament to whatever extent might be necessary.

Such flagrant injustice gave the loyalist party a blow from which it has never recovered. It strengthened the hands of all those who wished for chaos that they might be allowed to go their own way. It is a great testimony to the Archbishop's character that, in spite of all this muddling, almost everybody felt quite sure that the rugged old man really intended to be just.

The other example is connected with a much abler man, one whose acute mind and ecclesiastical knowledge fitted him to occupy high place in the Church, and especially to be the representative of the Anglican communion in the metropolis of the empire. We still feel his loss. Creighton really understood the situation better than anybody. He

[1] *Temple's Life*, vol. ii, p. 30.

saw that the Prayer Book must be the rallying-ground. He was opposed to coercion. He believed in the powers inherent in the episcopate. He was not swept away by sentiment. He had no craving for the limelight. He knew the world of books and the world of men. Of the people with whom he had to deal some were unreasonable and ignorant, some disloyal in spirit, but the greater part were reasonable and honest. They pleaded that the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament in parish churches, for the purpose of communicating the sick and dying, and the ceremonial use of incense were "laudable practices of the Catholic Church." Yet his answer practically asserted that he did not recognise such a thing as Catholic custom. A few days later he was writing: "The object of episcopacy was to secure the unity of the Church, to form a link between the several congregations." And yet it never seemed to dawn on him that this admirable definition was being applied by himself in a way which assumed that the Church in these islands was the whole body that had to be considered, and that outside these islands no Christian congregations existed.[1] In practice it would seem that his real view was that he was an Englishman first and a Christian afterwards.

There lay the whole problem. The Catholic revival had definitely made it impossible to think in this insular way any more. It had dared to say that, fundamentally, we were the same thing as

[1] *Life*, vol. ii, p 855.

Roman Catholics and Easterns, just as Bramhall, Laud and Andrewes had done. After that we could never go back. There were three courses open. The Church of England could either have entirely rejected the claim. This was impossible, and the mightiest efforts to bring it about failed as they had done before. We could say that we were the same thing entirely as the Romans. Or we could adopt the traditional Anglo-Catholic position which claims that we were a reformed part of the Catholic Church, having as its guide the "*quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus.*" If the last were accepted, anything which came within the common approbation of East and West must be held to possess great weight. The two things above referred to—reservation for the sick and the use of incense—were of such a character. There was nothing distinctively Roman about them. They had behind them that unity of the Church which it is a bishop's especial duty to guard. It was not the particular things, which were of comparatively secondary importance, so much as the insular view which lay behind that threw back the loyalists, whose position was more difficult and less superficially simple than those who founded all on Rome. If the position is to be now improved, it is necessary that the bishops should regard themselves first as officers of the Church of Christ, and then as officers of the Church of England.

The purpose of this retrospect into recent history has been to suggest that the troubles of the Church

in this land have been largely due to the failure of her officers and members to act up to her clear claim and wide aspiration. This claim and aspiration are not simple. But one element that is fundamental is this that I have called priesthood. I believe such an idea to be inherent in the religion of the New Testament as much as in the Old. The element is there all through, and is carried over into Catholicism. Let me now summarily make clear why to some of us it appears so valuable.

(1) It is a standing witness to the unity of mankind, and in its way a genuine realisation of it. Unity is of its essence. Some reject the necessity of any such thing. But this desire for unity is at once the consistent vision of Christianity and the way in which it can most help the world of the future. "In Christian theory there had been, from the moment of the Redeemer's birth or death, another society founded, in which the temporal distinctions of rank and wealth were unknown, and which would ultimately redress them; in which the bond was love, and its basis the certainty of faith." [1]

(2) "The certainty of faith." That is our second reason for holding fast to priesthood. Science will help, even economic considerations may assist, but we have proof before our eyes that they do not produce unity of themselves. The only root and ground can be because men believe in one God who made them and loves them. And of this there is no certainty outside the Christian faith.

[1] Marvin, *The Living Past*, p. 136.

(3) That faith takes as its basis certain historic happenings as revealing the nature and purpose of God. There are always at work tendencies which would dissolve Christianity into sentiment, or a moral code, or an intellectual theory, or even an engine of social progress. If it is to live it needs independence of all these things, and to seek in God alone its ultimate aim. Of this independence priesthood is the guardian. Once that is secure, the others can find their place in the great harmony.

(4) This faith founded on historic happenings is so mysterious and yet so plain, so abstract and so concrete, that it needs, if it is to exist in all its proportion and fulness, the body that it has shaped for itself. This body has never died. Its past is not dead, but part of its present, and still more of its future. There is something divine and absolute in this incorporation. It is the link which binds not only all history and the march of time, but living and dead are thereby caught up in one great supersensual whole. Of this the highest expression is the Holy Eucharist, the Divine Offering, the Mass, the Holy Communion, the Supper of the Lord, where we find not an extra or subordinate part of religion, but the key and centre of the world. For there is Jesus on the Cross, and there is Christ in heaven; there are the angels, the prophets and the martyrs; there is the Mother of the Lord; and there is the essence and being of God, the Eternal Trinity, in whom we live and move and have our being.

CHAPTER III

NATIONALITY

My conclusion, so far, is that the Reformation was primarily a demand for the redress of the grievances inherent in the absolutism of the papal administration over the Church. There was no discontent with the doctrines. If the Papacy could have put its administration into better order there would have been no Reformation, but the new learning would have modified men's attitude towards dogma without causing a breach in the unity of the Church."—Creighton, *Life*, vol. i, p. 266.

CHAPTER III

NATIONALITY

We have claimed in the first lecture that the Church of England is Catholic, a part of the true and actual Israel of God. Whatever else is to be said about her must come subsequent to that. A church which claims to be Protestant as well as Catholic must, at any rate, be Catholic first. You cannot add Catholicism to Protestantism. Again, a religion which sets out to be liberal must first be religious, and there is all the difference in the world between a liberal religion and religious liberalism. For an institution must be what it is before it can expand or modify its principles.

If I am right in my contention, the Christian religion is involved in an institution, because it believes in the Incarnation of God. And God Himself is to its view, even apart from the Incarnation, closely connected with the temporal unfolding of events. But He is what He is independently of the things of time. They are His revelation. Similarly the Church, though closely interwoven with its historical manifestation, is essentially the body of the Ascended Christ. Its historical manifestations, all that we have called priesthood, the

order, the Sacraments and the very ceremonies are valuable to us because they are a pledge and a realisation of the end for which all things were made, the free and interior union of men with Divinity and with one another, and the redemption of all creation.

Some pledge of unity, some sufficient signs that we are in the one Body of Christ, are the first essential for anything that would call itself Church. We have shown grounds for holding that the Anglican communion had always believed itself to have these signs. But this belief is attacked, both by those who uphold the Papal Monarchy as the true centre of unity, and by those who reject the whole Catholic idea of historic Christianity. The latter accept, as did Luther, the exclusive assumption of the name Catholic by Rome, and assert that the only true way to be a Christian is to be a Protestant.

Now the upholders of both these points of view have for three hundred years found the position of the Church of England unsatisfactory. It is because there are parties within our part of the Church raising precisely the same contrary objections against Dr. Gore's book, that I spoke of its standpoint (not its temper) as typical of the Anglican communion. It does not please Dr. Henson, and it does not please the Society of St. Peter and St. Paul. It is not what is called logical enough for either.

The Papal Monarchy has always been, and still is, an enormously attractive thing. Apart from the fact that the communion, of which it is the

head, ceaselessly displays an intense zeal for souls, an unwavering witness to supernatural faith, and a considerable spirit of independence as against the influences which would make religion a thing of this world only, there are two main causes for this appeal. It satisfies those to whom outward unity of organisation is the first requirement, and it seems to provide a living, recognisable voice for the Church. Let us acknowledge facts and recognise how much the modern world demands such things. Great combines are the order of the day in business, and international trusts are balanced by the attempt to bridge the boundaries of nations by a brotherhood of labour. Though the latter has so far not been so successful as the former, in both, closely knit unity of organisation is essential to their existence. Political parties become more strictly regimented, and nations, in order to live, have to submit to discipline in a way that they had never dreamt of. Nothing succeeds like success, and men will forgo a great deal for the sake of prosperity. Prussia-Germany and the United States of America are both examples of the way in which great communities will willingly place themselves in the hands of one man, who will be quite clear and decided on the main point which keeps a community prosperous, though in the former it was conceived that war was the essential means, and in the latter peace.

The Pope and the President have both had a great opportunity, just because men have looked to them for moral guidance. The fact that the

result has not been anything of universal value, beyond the mere enunciation of the blessings of peace, is full of significance. For it suggests that no sectional organisation is in the position to be the arbiter or, in more than a limited sense, even the teacher of the world. Now it is an essential part of the position of Rome that the Church, centralised in the hands of the Pope, is such an arbiter and supreme authority. It claims obedience. There is a point in all religion where obedience is not only a virtue, but a necessity, for, in the end, religion is not agreement but surrender. This obedience, however, is due to the Divine Will, and only secondarily to the organisation which is its imperfect expression. Rome demands worship of the means of unity rather than of unity itself.

The Catholic doctrine of God involves an intimate connection with the Church, but it always has to be remembered that it is the Church that belongs to God, not God to the Church. There is in the human mind a constant tendency to fix the Divine Essence down to some earthly manifestation or consequence of the Incarnation, and to make the substance of religion something here. Of this the Roman view of the Church is the most notable, though by no means the only, perhaps not even the most dangerous example. It is equally true of those who identify the Church with the State, as of those who make Christianity consist in social reform or in the preservation of what is called peace on earth. All these are various forms of forgetting that Christ's Kingdom is not of this world.

Let us take as an example of the Roman position the words of Leo XIII—

"To this end he established in the Church all those principles which necessarily tend to make organised human societies, and through which they attain the perfection proper to each. That is, in it (the Church) all who wished to be the sons of God by adoption might attain to the perfection demanded by their high calling, and might obtain salvation. The Church, therefore, as we have said, is man's guide to whatever pertains to heaven. This is the office appointed unto it by God: that it may watch over and may order all that concerns religion, and may without let or hindrance exercise, according to its judgment, its charge over Christianity. Wherefore they who pretend that the Church has any wish to interfere in Civil matters, or to infringe upon the rights of the State, know it not, or wickedly calumniate it. . . .

"Indeed, no true and perfect human society can be conceived which is not governed by some supreme authority. Christ, therefore, must have given to His Church a supreme authority to which all Christians must render obedience. . . . Certainly Christ is a King for ever; and, though invisible, He continues unto the end of time to govern and guard His Church from heaven. But since He willed that His kingdom should be visible, He was obliged, when He ascended into heaven, to designate a vice-gerent on earth.[1] Jesus Christ therefore appointed Peter to be the head of the Church,

[1] Cf. S. Thomas, *Contra Gentiles*, lib. 4, c. 76.

and he also determined that the authority instituted in perpetuity for the salvation of all should be inherited by his successors, in whom the same authority of Peter himself should continue." [1]

Apart from its false history and its subservience to human logic, it will be seen that such a conception identifies the Church with its organisation. It is this which is the seed of the trouble. All organisations tend to become more interested in themselves than in the principles for which they stand, and there is a point in their history when the only cure for the disease is their destruction. It is this disease which has eaten deeply into the Roman system. It has become a state with "interests" like other states, and it is a state of the dynastic order, where the preservation of the dynasty is the chief concern of its servants. Of such a Church the Austrian Government is the natural ally. The inevitable result has been expressed, though in too harsh a form, by Tyrrell: "Rome cares nothing for religion—only for power; and for religion as a source of power." [2]

Rome does care for religion, but in critical decisions the love of power seizes the helm. That is why, in the countries where her influence is great, she is felt to be seditious. That is why she employed, with regard to the seizure of the Austrian ambassador's house by the Italian Government, a

[1] *Encyclical Letter of Pope Leo XIII*, June 29, 1896, authorised translation published by the Catholic Truth Society.

[2] *Life*, vol. ii, p. 355.

vigour of reproach which Louvain and Rheims were unable to call forth.

The seeds of this love of power were sown long ago, the exact point of their entry being an interesting study for the curious historian. We are not in the least concerned to prove that this power has been at all times a disadvantage to the cause of religion. It is difficult to see how the Church could have survived materialistic and barbaric ages without some very definite and clear form of authority; though it is an arguable point, whether the concentration of all government in one town and one pair of hands was not always more of a hindrance than a help.

It was accepted in this country for five hundred years and more, as a symbol of the unity of Christendom. In worship and in canon law the custom of England was the custom of the rest of the Western Church. But two facts ought to be remembered. First: freedom of thought and speech were, in the Middle Ages, possible within the Church to an extent which post-Tridentine Rome could never allow. It was just because there were so many corporations, kings and countries, bishops, universities, etc., which each had their place and weight. Second: England, whether because far away, or from a natural sturdiness of temper, was in a constant state of protest against the usurpations of Papal authority. Remembering this, we see that what happened at the Reformation in this country was only the conclusion of a long story.

I have already attempted to show that what took

place here was not a fundamental revolution, either as to the nature of doctrine or the ancient character and constitution of the Church. But it was an assertion of the rights of nationality. It was not a denial of the idea of a supreme authority in the Church. It was a very definite rejection of the idea that that supreme authority had been committed to any head on earth. It was a rejection of the notion that there could be any vice-gerent of Christ. It placed the claims of the Papacy before the bar of history, and found them to be an innovation on Catholic custom. It even more strongly opposed the assertion that any foreigner had the right to lord it over the people of England. It could not see that there was any divine necessity that there should be a Vice-God—the phrase is Bellarmin's—still less that he should always be an Italian.

All this is expressed in the familiar words: "The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this realm of England," and "Every particular or national Church hath authority to ordain, change, and abolish ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying."

The Church of England, then, won its freedom as a national Church in the sixteenth century, and the recognition of this fact is an essential for any one who would be a loyal member of that body. We may deplore, I am sure we ought to deplore, the loss of unity which the Reformation involved. We do not need to hide that there was much harm

involved. We should not be blind to the terrible break-up of the public and social recognition of religion which came in its train, nor to the fact that piety in the country districts was driven underground, and had to find an outlet in all sorts of fanatical and enthusiastic individualisms. We need not deny that there was associated with the movement something which was not only not religious, but anti-religious, a strange compound of barbarism and rationalism.

These things have all to be weighed in. But the essential point to be faced is, What was the cause? There can be but one answer. There were terrible vices deeply rooted in the body of the Church. Of these, two exercised a dominant influence: the tyranny of the foreigner, and the traffic in holy things. Many, perhaps most, now are shocked when they read violent denunciations poured out by the reformers on the mass, on images, on the confessional, on the veneration of the saints. But we have to inquire the cause. There were base elements at work, and human greed, as so often, masqueraded as the friend of progress, but, in the main, it was a moral and Christian objection. It comes out in such a sentence as the following, taken from one of the Homilies: "What dens of thieves the churches of England have been made by the blasphemous buying and selling the most precious body and blood of Christ in the mass." [1] It was an instinct akin to that of Christ when he

[1] "The Sermon for repairing and keeping clean, and comely adorning of Churches."

turned the money-changers out of the Temple. That was what Luther felt. That was what the Englishmen felt too. The greatest proof of the need of the Reformation is to be found in the fact that it affected Papist and Protestant alike. Indeed, the strange thing is that it was attended by a greater spiritual revival amongst those who remained faithful to the Pope than amongst those who rejected him.

But the abuses, though they were repressed, were yet not extinguished, and the papal autocracy, so far from being diminished, took an immense leap forward. This it is that justifies our separation.

We have, then, a National Church, and we have to inquire a little more closely what is meant by it.

First, it is quite clear, it was an experiment. And there are people who do not like experiments, or at least they prefer such as do not insist too openly upon their experimental character. They lean rather to such things as appear to be logical developments involving neither pain nor thought.

Secondly, it was a national experiment, which in one sense is still going on. It was national because it was an assertion that Englishmen were going to manage their own religious affairs without interference from the foreigner. We need not be in the least ashamed of this. France, at various periods of her history (and those not the least intelligent or attractive), would have dearly loved to do the same. The history of Gallicanism is

proof. Dr. Figgis has reminded us that Febronianism was a German attempt of the same order. Wherever Catholicism has been most closely identified with the national life, there it has a wonderful strength and savour still. I remember a thoughtful French priest deploring to me the difference in this matter between his country and Germany. In the one it was aristocratic and anti-national. In the country of Luther Catholicism was of the people, redolent of the soil, natural and at home.

It is no new gibe that the Church of England desires Catholicism without the Pope, and it is not one of which we need be in the least afraid. It is an honour to our nation that it has really tried to effect that which has been the dream of so many of the best minds, and no disgrace that it has evolved something so very like what Erasmus adumbrated. The Catholic religion has, at all times, drawn many minds who have been quite sure that curialism was a vice and spiritual tyranny to be resisted to the death. This is what makes it quite comical to say that when we insist on this position we are adopting a theory of Catholicity which is rejected by all other Catholics, and which is peculiar to a sub-section of a sub-national Church on an island in north-western Europe.[1] As a matter of fact, an experiment in National Christianity, which should be at the same time orthodox, primitive and full of supernatural religion, has been going on for at least nine hundred years in the Slavonic and other countries of eastern Europe.

[1] Cf. Dr. Inge, *Guardian*, Oct. 26, 1916.

This has been strangely neglected by Englishmen. The *Times* had to learn from laudatory articles in the Petrograd newspapers that a remarkable Englishman had died in Norfolk. But Mr. Birkbeck was simply the continuation of a steady tradition which had since the sixteenth century been quite aware that there was a greater spiritual kinship between the Orthodox and the English Church than there ever could be between either and the Roman.[1] Our position is similar to the Russian. But the fact that it is not exactly the same need not disturb Englishmen. For this island in north-western Europe has a way of arriving at results which the rest of the world strives after, and in the end imitates, and this not through any extra cleverness or ingenious plans, but through some native instinct which has a genius for working from facts rather than theories. You may call it illogical if you will, but the result is highly rational. You may say that it is founded upon sentiment, but it is a sentiment which stands strains that would break more iron constitutions.

And so the first essential in that national experiment which we call the Church of England I should unhesitatingly claim to be freedom. This is the meaning of its nationality. It has freed itself from the Pope implicitly, and with him went the idea of an autocratic authority in church affairs.

I have shown how resistance to the Pope was largely resistance to the foreigner. It is interesting to trace how very much the other freedom, the

[1] Cf. Bramhall, vol. i, p. 200.

resistance to efforts at complete protestantisation, have taken on an anti-foreign character.

There was not only the fact that the first reformers, Jewel and Cranmer, went their own way. But when the riotous exiles returned from Strasburg, Parker soon had cause to complain of "Germanical tempers"; and, later, the Dutch Protestantism of William of Orange had to suffer a snub. He wished to be thanked for his zeal "for the Protestant religion in general and the Church of England in particular." But this was changed by Convocation to thanks for the "honour, peace, advantage and establishment of the Church of England: whereby we doubt not the interests of the Protestant religion in all other Protestant churches, which is dear to us, will be secured."

It is perhaps forgotten that the Oxford movement itself was aroused, in a large measure, by dangers that seemed to threaten from Germany. Pusey was concerned by the growth of German rationalism, Newman and Keble by the attempt of the Court party to foist on the Anglican Church an artificial connection with Prussian Lutheranism by the proposal about the Jerusalem bishopric. It was the same national instinct at work that made churchmen resist so violently, and fortunately so successfully, the desperate policy of A. C. Tait, whom they, with some justification, felt to be a Scotch presbyterian in disguise.

But if proof of the immense strength of the Anglican position as a combination of Catholicism with a free and genuine national spirit be wanted,

it can be seen most easily and clearly in the most English of all great English names. Shakespeare is the truest expression of the soul of the English Church. The admirable words of Canon Ainger will doubtless be remembered by some here. "It was still an age of Faith, but the soul of man was brought into freer, nearer communion with God; Hope was new-born; new national developments had become possible; thought was free, but it was not irreligious. . . . The ethics of the old Catholicism, with its judgments of conduct and character, were almost as fixed and vivid for Shakespeare as they were for Dante." [1] Mr. Marvin puts the same thought, when he says of this "grandest figure": "He is Catholic to the Catholics, patriot in Elizabethan England, philosopher in his deep questionings on the nature and purpose of our being." [2]

The nationality of the English Church, then, is shown in its determination to be itself. This independence has left many scars. For the Church has had to stand up against the Pope abroad and the State at home. The civil authority played a great part in the English Reformation. It had to do so, if freedom from outside was to be won. We should be less inclined to apologise for this if we remembered that the laity are part of the Church, and it was only as believing members of the Christian body that they acted. If their morals were not attractive, they were no worse than those of the Renaissance popes. But there really was in this

[1] *Lectures and Essays*, vol. i, p. 116.
[2] Marvin, *The Living Past*, p 166.

influence the seeds of another tyranny. It is natural for statesmen to care more for uniformity than principle. *Cujus regio ejus religio* was a formula that made a ready appeal to their minds. And so there has always been a tendency to adopt this eminently Prussian plan in various forms, ranging from Acts of Uniformity to undenominationalism, the underlying notion being that it was more important that the Church should embrace all Englishmen, than that it should consist of Christians.

All attempts, then, to impose conditions of unity on the ecclesiastical body and to tie it to statutes are doomed to failure. To try to do so was not without justification when the government of the state was in the hands of professing Christians. It becomes not only ludicrous, but actually impossible when that Government consists of persons of all sorts of religious faith. Impossible, for the House of Commons has no time for such matters. The simple fact is well expressed in a recent report: "The congestion of secular business alone is very great, and it appears increasingly unlikely that any Government brought into power under modern democratic conditions, and overwhelmed with matters which call for legislative action, will have leisure for detailed consideration of Church questions." [1]

We must, I think, recognise the hand of God guiding us on to a new step in the direction of freedom. After the war there will have to be

[1] *Report of the Archbishops' Committee on Church and State*, p. 29.

a thorough reconsideration of the duties of the empire's Government, and large measures of devolution must follow. Among these there should be included a greater opportunity on the part of the Church to manage her own affairs. The exact meaning of "Establishment" is an obscure question. So much so that when the present Master of Magdalene, in a letter to the *Times*, asked the Archbishop of York to enlighten the lay mind on the matter, as far as I observed no answer was forthcoming. Many who are inclined to wish for the removal of Establishment if it means just blocking up the channels of the spirit, are yet coming to recognise more and more the sacredness of the State, and the great opportunity it offers for the practice of Christianity. It is this feeling, combined with the wise conservatism which is characteristic of English churchmen in religious matters, which has prompted the proposals of the Committee on Church and State.

It is much to be hoped that the great mass of loyal members of the Church will rally to these proposals to the extent, at any rate, of seeing that they are given a fair trial. They are strenuously opposed by extreme men on either side. One party fears the new organisation will be too exclusively clerical, the other objects to the introduction of the lay element. The former tell us that if it comes into being, "the clergy will impose the destruction of the Reformation Settlement on a reluctant nation."[1] But two things effectually

[1] H. H. Henson, *Quarterly Review*, Oct. 1916.

destroyed that "Settlement" long ago: one was the toleration of William and Mary, the other was the admitting of Dissenters and Roman Catholics to Parliament. It is almost beyond hyperbole to say that the establishment of a National Church Council would mean the "severance of its connection with the national life," in face of the enormous and, on the whole, beneficent influence exercised by the Nonconformists to-day. And, after all, the power of Parliament is still there in the background.

But surely their fears are unreasonable. We must trust the Spirit of God and the common-sense of Englishmen which, in combination, have already given to the Church so much independence and width. Liberty is needed for the ecclesiastical body. It is the only condition of reform. The National Mission is revealing, it is also increasing, a steadily growing demand for reform, springing up within the Church itself. The fact is full of hope, but it forces us to consider what are the only possible alternatives. One is disestablishment outright. The other is government by archiepiscopal committees. There is a strong feeling, which will rapidly become more vocal, that the latter is entirely foreign to the English Church. The intention is excellent. But the net effect is to increase the influence of the Metropolitans and the introduction of a system which is a pale reflection of curialism. Freedom is part of our true essence, and a sense of the supremacy of the body over its members. That is the English conception in secular affairs. It happens to be also the Christian concep-

tion in Church affairs. Where these two points of view agree, it is surely only wise to work for its realisation.

Those who object to the method by which the Archbishops' Committee for the National Mission, and now for its continuance, were appointed—and they are, I trust and think, a large body—can only improve the situation by working for some more corporate and representative solution. The *status quo* is impossible and intolerable. The curse of it is backstairs influence and Lambeth lists. It has all the faults without the virtues of a Government office. The vices, in one case as in the other, are not due so much to human wickedness as to human weakness. And the only cure is responsibility and publicity.

The real ground of objection comes from those who dread an infringement of the liberty which at present exists. The liberal fears that he will be expelled from a church which knows its own mind, and the man who values the Catholic tradition and piety shrinks from the heavy and unsympathetic hand which he has known only too well in the past. And yet both, if they really believe in the Church of England, surely have nothing to fear. We must have courage, and we must take risks.

There are some words which are employed by a thoughtful writer in the *Round Table* which may fitly be transferred to Church affairs. "No society can be permanently healthy which does not govern itself. Government from above is often the preliminary necessity in order to sweep away abuses,

to protect a politically backward people from outside forces they have not learned to control, to enable them in peace to learn the meaning of civilised law and order. But it is essentially transitional, paving the way for the time when its people, having grasped the principle of citizenship, can begin to take an active share in building a better world for themselves. The business of transfer, however, is a matter of infinite difficulty. Self-government is not a mere question of democratic machinery. It implies the growth of a sober sense of responsibility."

"A sober sense of responsibility." Surely that is just the thing that is most wanting in the members of the Church of England. The parson is irresponsible because he is a fixture. The people are irresponsible because they think religion should be managed by the parson. The Diocesan Conferences are irresponsible because they have no power. The bishops are irresponsible because they have both too little and too much. The archbishops are irresponsible because they despair of making the bishops agree. The result is chaos. An immense amount of energy and faith is being put out, as much as at any time in our history. But everybody is conducting a private war, and it is not surprising if the consequent progress is disappointing.

And it is all because we are still being governed from above long after we were ready to pass out of that essentially transitional stage. Here, again, the Bishop of Oxford has sounded the true note

when he insists that the bishops are not intended to be leaders, but to be administrators, who keep the body together, and give expression to the common mind of the Church. At present each has a doctrine, each a tongue, because they have not realised that their function is organic rather than individual. Dr. Gore was right when he said that bishops were not necessarily prophets, and, as the *Manchester Guardian* remarked, it took something of a prophet to say so.

The fact is that, just as in the State we have learnt to subordinate our own predilections to the common good, so must we do in the Church. The fact that we are members of Christ's Body lays upon us all a great obligation. We owe loyalty rather than duties because he is our living Master, and the community consists of our brethren for whom Christ died. The inner meaning of the Church is love, and, if we believe that, we may have sufficient faith in God to trust that it will triumph. The only people who need fear are those who are wedded to some preconceived plan. Those who wish to compel the Church of England to accept a view of Catholicism which finds its only criterion in the commands of Rome, will oppose anything that makes for an ordered liberty. But that will not be the feeling of those who recognise that the Catholicism towards which the Anglican communion seems to be appointed to work, is one which, while it is the heir of the past, yet sets its face towards the future. They will only be too glad that there should be opportunities for mutual

and frank discussion, and an agreement to live and let live for the sake of the body; an agreement which is real and not conventional, because the body has itself made it.

But the liberty for which the Church of England stands is not only liberty for the ecclesiastical body, it is also, to use the distinction of Soloviev, religious liberty, liberty for the individual.[1] The conditions of her history—or, in other words, the hand of God—have impressed this note upon her. Free play for individuality and the balance of various forces were the great characteristics of the Middle Ages. It was the breakdown of this balance that produced the schism in the West. The fact that we possess something similar is not a sign of our lack of catholicity, but the contrary. It is certainly an essential note of our English experiment. The Reformation arose in part, at any rate, from a new emphasis on the value of the individual. In England our constant endeavour in Church and State has been to accept this fact and to rejoice in it, but at the same time to correlate with it the claims of society and the wealth of the past.

Nothing could show more plainly the mind of the English Church than its teaching about confession. The practice is quite definitely and clearly retained, and all priests of the Church have to be ready to hear confessions; but there is no obligation beyond the promptings of conscience, and the patient has to decide what he needs. There is thus not only

[1] *La Russie et l'Église Universelle*

a freedom for the individual which is bracing in itself, but there is scope for teaching which shall lay great stress on the value of this sacramental ordinance, so long as it stops short of making it obligatory, and for teaching which keeps it as a last resource, if it does not go so far as to deny its existence, or restrict the freedom of its exercise.

What I would urge, then, is that we should love, honour and cherish our Mother Church, not because we believe that it is the final form of Christianity, but because we believe it contains within it many things difficult to hold together, yet necessary to the fulness of the Catholic religion. We should honour it because it is a great experiment, worthy of men who believe in Christ and are proud to be Englishmen. For, while our race may be unimaginative as a whole, yet by its stubborn clinging to facts, however awkward, it goes further than more brilliant brains and becomes, in the problems of human government, the laboratory of the world.

It is a cheering thought to remember that all the charges made against the English Church have been equally levelled against the British empire. Both have been held to be incoherent, untidy, loose-limbed, hypocritical, held together by sentiment rather than by organisation.

But as in the case of the empire, when danger became serious, the dim, unconscious multitudes rallied round the flag, proving that ordered liberty was a truer bond than a bureaucratic autocracy had dreamed of. So when the dangers which threaten the Anglican communion are grasped by

the great mass of her slow-thinking, but not stupid or disloyal children, they will insist that she shall lose nothing of her ancient order or Catholic worship, or genuine freedom. The ideal for empire and for Church is the same, and may be expressed in the two words, "ordered liberty."

And this ideal is, in both cases, not one which we desire to force upon our neighbours. We do not desire an English world or a dominant Anglicanism. We wish, in the one case, to contribute our experiment towards the making of a league of nations at once friends and free, and, in the other, we look for a comity of Christians, united by their belief that the Wisdom of God is perfectly expressed in Jesus Christ, and in the large variety of the manifestations he has made of himself in the Church his Spirit has fashioned.

To each there is a similar conception opposed. Prussia-Germany desires a peace which will be due to the fact that their enemies have become their footstool, because they have filled the places with dead bodies, and smitten the heads over divers countries. The Papacy contemplates a Church to which all others shall bow, a unity demanded, not by the brotherhood of Christians, the fellowship of the saints, or the Lordship of Christ, but by an autocracy which, by claiming to be his Vice-gerent, has displaced him.

It is sometimes urged that Rome recognises individuality, and allows nations their own rites in worship. The Uniat churches are pointed to as an example. But Prince Max of Saxony, in his

Vorlesungen über die Orientalische Kirchenfrage, a book remarkable for its candour and sympathy, shows the true state of affairs when he complains that, in ecclesiastical spirit and love for the Church, the Catholic Easterns are very defective. Especially is their love for the Papal See "*nicht übermässig gross.*" Many of them, it appears, have still in their breasts the old thought that their patriarchs are at least as good as the Pope of Rome. A Uniat Church is a vain dream.

Let us, in conclusion, remember the stimulating words written by George Tyrrell ten years ago. He recalls how before all Christians there lies a great problem of reconciliation. This is a work which seems impossible for Græco-Roman Catholicism, on the one side, or for rationalistic Protestantism on the other.

"While Roman—or at all events Græco-Roman—Catholicism is big enough to be pardoned the egotism of ignoring the planetary or planetoid bodies outside its pale, so that Roman liberals excusably plan their "Church of the Future" without due reference to the needs of outsiders, Protestant liberalism, so far as it works out its synthesis without reference to full two-thirds of Christendom, is still less likely to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion. In a word, Roman Liberals are too far removed from the Protestant standpoint, and Protestant Liberals from the Roman standpoint, not to suffer from certain limitations of understanding and sympathy unfavourable to an impartial balancing of rival claims. What is needed for that

end, however, is not the indifference of a Gallio, not the cold objectivity of an outsider "holding no form of creed but contemplating all," but rather a comprehensive interest in each of the opposing causes, that will not rest till it has reconciled them in some higher synthesis.

"Such a comprehensiveness has been at once the glory and the shame of Anglicanism. By the very circumstances of its origin, as an independent offshoot of Western Christendom, it is a compromise between the Catholic principle of authority and the Protestant principle of individualism—a compromise and syncretism rather than a synthesis. It has preferred to sacrifice logical consistency rather than accept the fanaticism of unbridled authority, or the counter-fanaticism of unbridled individualism, and rather than face a premature synthesis of the two." [1]

Again, "her claim is to be seeking rather than to have attained the synthesis of liberty and authority and a rule of faith." And when we are tempted to think our Mother Church is all faults and other communions all virtues, it will be useful to remember his pathetic cry: "Church of my baptism! Church of Westcott, Hort, Lightfoot, Church, Liddon, Taylor, Leighton, Coleridge! Church of better-than-saints, why did I ever leave you?"

[1] *Life*, vol. ii, p. 367.

CHAPTER IV

WISDOM

The struggle between these two opposite tendencies—the Catholic Christian and the national heathen—continues in our popular consciousness to the present time. And upon the question which of these two principles conquers in the Russian soul depends entirely the realization by Russia of that mission which is expressed in the idea of Saint Sophia. Nationalism is not only opposed to this idea in root and essence, it forms a direct revolt from it. In actual fact, in Sophia all the tribes of the earth are gathered into one whole humanity : in her not only all people—all nations are called upon to reign together.—Prince Eugene Trubetskoy, *Saint Sophia, Russia's Hope and Calling,* trans. by L. Alexeiev. The Faith Press, 1916.

Etre universel en idée, dans sa puissance rationelle (image de Dieu), l'homme doit devenir effectivement semblable à Dieu en réalisant activement son unité dans la plénitude de la création . . . par lui tout le monde extradivin doit devenir un seul corps vivant—incarnation totale de la Sagesse divine.—Vladimir Soloviev, *La Russie et L'Église Universelle,* p. 257. Paris, P. V. Stock, 1906.

CHAPTER IV

WISDOM

We closed our last lecture with the pathetic cry of Father Tyrrell to the Church of his baptism: "Church of Westcott, Hort, Lightfoot, Church, Liddon, Taylor, Leighton, Coleridge! Church of better-than-saints, why did I ever leave you?"

To-day we ask what was the meaning of that cry. He did not transfer his allegiance in the end, for there were cords that held him tight to his adopted mother, even though she scorned him. He saw in her a greater variety and largeness, a stronger union of all sorts and conditions of men than he found in the Anglican communion. These things were perverted and misused by those in power, yet they were there. If the tremulous faith and the popular devotion, to which his soul was so closely akin, could have been combined with this other element, he would have found that haven of rest for which his mind longed, the Church of the Future which was the substance of his dreams.

And it is this element which the Anglican communion has to contribute to that future Church of which we think to-day. What was the quality

manifested by these "better-than-saints"? Might it not be defined in the words of Ben-Sira?—

> "Wisdom was created before all,
> And wise insight from everlasting.
> One there is who is wise, greatly to be feared;
> The Lord sitting upon His throne;
> He himself created her, and saw and numbered her,
> And poured her out upon all His works;
> In measure upon all flesh,
> But without measure doth He grant her to them that love Him."[1]

They were, to Tyrrell, living manifestations of the existence of a spirit which his soul felt to be really present in the history of Christianity. The spirit which animates the Church of Christ has already, in these few centuries of her existence, shown herself identical, at least in tendency, with that spirit of wisdom which the Scripture describes as "understanding, holy, one, manifold, subtle, active, quick, which nothing hindereth, having all power, overseeing all things, and containing all spirits."

Let us then proceed to analyse what we mean by the spirit of wisdom, and to see how far it seems to be a property of the Anglican Church.

The most important element in wisdom is truth. It is that which distinguishes the wisdom that is from above from the wisdom of the world.

The question which all religion has to face is: Is it true? Our Lord said, I am the Truth, and the Christian Church has always held the teaching of the Truth it learns from him to be the principal ground of its existence.

[1] *The Wisdom of Ben-Sira,* trans. by W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D., p. 14. S.P.C.K.

But as soon as the question of truth is raised, the difficulty that each man has to meet is the method of its discovery. Nobody can start out on that voyage *de novo*, or only the rarest minds. And there does not seem to be any likelihood that such a voyage is more likely to land the adventurer in harbour. For, after all, religion of some kind, some sense of relationship with higher forces, is for most people a necessity of daily life. And therefore they have to take it from somewhere; they cannot evolve it from their inner consciousness. Even so strong and convinced a believer in individual judgment in matters of religion as Dr. Rashdall says, "I do not mean to deny that the individual must at first, and may quite reasonably in some cases throughout life, accept much of his religious belief on authority; but that is only because he may be justified in thinking that such and such a person, or, more probably, such and such a religious community, is more likely to be right than himself." [1] These words are the wise and reasonable recognition of a fundamental fact, and are in marked contrast to the hysterical language which the mere mention of authority in matters of faith produces in some quarters.

The truth is that faith is acting on probabilities, and these must be supplied by something which is accepted as revelation. Authority, then, is a fundamental element in religion, and it would be almost true to say that, when that question is settled, the major difficulties with regard to faith

[1] *Philosophy and Religion*, p. 152. Pub. Duckworth. 1909.

are passed. The real problem is, What are the criteria by which the authority is to be accepted?

Authority and private judgment are not necessarily opposed, because, except in those instances, which become rarer with the advance of education, where a traditional belief remains unquestioned throughout life, the individual has to employ his intelligence and conscience in deciding to what system he shall adhere.

There are, roughly speaking, three methods of reaching assurance in matters of faith, which may be denominated the Ultramontane, the Catholic and the Lutheran. At the outset of an inquiry into the nature and validity of religious truth, we are met by the former. It is expressed in the majestic figure of Rome saying to the world, "Here is the Christian religion, entire and unchanged, except in so far as piety has produced legitimate developments. It is universal, so that wherever you go you will find it the same. It has never faltered in saying that the faith is supernatural in origin, nor has it allowed the powers of human reason, or the influences of worldly diplomacy or politics, to influence its attitude to the great fundamental verities. Prophecy, miracle and vision were the first guarantees of the Faith, and they have never ceased from the Catholic Church. Heresies have arisen, but the wonderful insight of Rome has always detected them, and its heaven-aided power always been the main element in their destruction."

It is of the essence of this theory that the whole tradition as it stands is impeccable and inexpugn-

able. The main citadel of the Faith is strongly guarded by a series of outworks, in which no inch of ground is ever yielded. Criticism of the parts is disloyalty to the whole, though such criticism might be allowed if not too public or aggressive.

The great point is that there is a whole. You may not like details, but you accept it or reject it as a whole. In order to see the strength of the position, let us adopt the words of a thoughtful writer who was attracted towards this position some twenty years ago, and has since, I believe, accepted it. "The Church centred at Rome takes as its authority its own governing body, or person, for the time being, subject to the limitation that this authority cannot reverse its own decisions given in previous ages. The Roman doctrines are built up by a process of organic growth just as a system of jurisprudence develops in the hands of judges through centuries. The decisions of the last Vatican Council are as valid, in the Roman Catholic view, as those of the first Council of Jerusalem. . . . The Church of Rome claims to be constantly guided by the Spirit of Truth, and denies that it can err. The Roman Church retained all existing decisions, and continued to decide and define. Thus true continuity exists in this Church, together with the living power of extension, development and advance." [1]

Here, then, the government is everything, and the only business of the individual is to submit.

[1] *A Reported Change in Religion,* by Onyx, p. 110. Pub. Arnold. 1899.

Authority is alive, active, governmental and infallible. The Church is divided into two halves—*Ecclesia discens*, and *Ecclesia docens*—and the Revelation is entirely in the hands of the former, by whom its truth is guaranteed.

Now the sharpest contrast to all this is to be found in the position which I have called Lutheran. For Luther, in spite of illogical hanging on to Creed and Sacraments, and in spite, too, of his attempt to make the Bible the only authority for religion, did, as a matter of fact, initiate in the world the new thought that the authority for man's religion is to be found within his own soul, and there alone. "Sola Fide justificatur." He is the true father of all those, whether it be the Kaiser or the conscientious objector, who, in matters of the greatest importance, possess within themselves a court of appeal, to which no outside evidence, no voice of the community as a whole, no process of reason, can be subpœnaed. They know what they believe, and they know that what they believe is true. They disdain argument and scorn proof as much as the Ultramontane. For the two are alike in this: each has an infallible authority. But the one finds it in an institution, the other finds it in himself.

It is plain that each of these views thus extremely stated may shade off, by imperceptible gradations, into one another. For the mass of mankind is not prepared entirely to be ruled by a corporation, nor to place absolute reliance on the unaided use of the processes of the individual mind. The

Ultramontane and the thoroughgoing Protestant, the upholder of an authority armed cap-à-pie and the devotee of the Spirit, by which is meant his own spirit, are not likely to divide the world between them. The fanatic is a most valuable element in human society, but he is entirely subversive of its very existence, if he makes his appearance in great numbers.

What, then, is the position of the Church of England towards these questions of authority, revelation and truth?

First it should be observed that it was only in contradistinction to the rejected claims of Rome that it set out to have any position of its own at all. It only wished, as far as these great matters were concerned, to be part of the One Holy Church, to believe what the Church believed, to do what the Church did. Its "established doctrine" and "laudable practices" are not only those of the Church of England; they have behind them "the whole Catholick Church of Christ."

If by private judgment be meant the right of anybody to believe what he likes, while remaining a teacher, or even a member of the society, then it is patently contrary to the facts of history to maintain that it is what Anglicanism has stood for from the first. As throughout the Catholic Church, an authoritative creed meets the believer at Baptism, and another forms part of his worship at the Eucharist. In the ordination service the Scriptures are placed in a very high position, and the bishop, and also the priest, are required to accept doctrine

and discipline as the Church and Realm hath received the same, and bidden to drive away erroneous and strange doctrine. In the Articles, the three creeds are described as thoroughly to be received and believed. And there was, of course, no intention on the part of those who promulgated them that their acceptance or rejection should be matters of private preference. On the contrary, His Majesty's declaration says with great emphasis that "the Bishops and Clergy" shall have power to do all such things as they are able to persuade the Sovereign "shall concern the settled Continuance of the Doctrine and Discipline of the Church of England now established; from which We will not endure any variation or departing in the least Degree."

Times have changed since then, and men obtained the right to belong or not to belong to the Church, which is still associated with this Realm. But for that reason, if for no other, it has been the case that her authoritative standards have remained. The Church of England believes and accepts what the Catholic Church believes and accepts. So almost all her members would agree. It is in the interpretation of these words that the problem arises for members of the communion.

There are, as I have hinted, those to whom the words are so vague as to mean almost nothing.

There is another body, larger, more coherent and, therefore, more powerful, which maintains that the Catholic Church there referred to is that part of Christendom which acknowledges the supremacy

of the Pope. This situation is produced by two causes: the first is the magic of words. The world at large takes things at their face valuation. English people are especially ready to call men that which men call themselves. They accept General Booth as General because he says so. The Roman Church claims that it is the Catholic Church; it needs some acquaintance with history and with other countries to test the claim, and so it is acknowledged. What the Roman Church believes and does is regarded as Catholic.

It would not be an exaggeration to say that the majority of English men and women have not yet grasped the fact that the English Church claims to be Catholic in a perfectly real and objective sense. Seeing that the claim has always been made, and that now for close on eighty years it has been revived by a most wonderful and self-denying outburst of faith and energy, it would seem strange that it should be so. But the fact remains, and will not appear so strange when we remember that the teachings of the clergy on Sundays, or the learned lucubrations of historians in their studies, are but small weight to set against the great engine of the history teaching which goes on in the schools of England on the other six days of the week. In one widely used book they are taught that "Elizabeth finally established the Church of England," and this book, it is amusing to note, is largely used in so-called Church schools.

But there is another and a weightier reason, or class of reasons, that has led a large number of

members of the Church of England to identify Catholic with Roman Catholic. It is partly that the official leaders have tended to aim at policy rather than principle. They have not spoken as Catholic bishops, or even as a body, and so those who reverenced the dogmas of the Church came to feel more and more that there was no essential security in the Anglican position. They found themselves in the English Church. Through it they received the sacraments, and were enabled to practise the religious life. It kept them in touch, more or less, with their countrymen. More and more they came to feel that the outworks of the Catholic Faith, the veneration of our Lady and the saints, the exposition of the reserved Sacrament, and other things, were, after all, essential as bulwarks of the position. They viewed Catholicism as we have learnt in this war to regard a fortress, where modern trenches, at a considerable distance from the centre, are, rather than the more permanent works within, the real battleground.

Criticism, which had begun with the outlying parts (the Old Testament and the traditions of the Church), was now, or so it appeared, sapping the foundations. It was the Apostles', not the Athanasian formula, that was attacked. They asked themselves: "Where will these things end? Shall we soon see the day when it will be with us as it is with Germany, where the removal of Herr Pastor Jatho from his post, because he taught that there was no personal God and no immortality, caused a furore of protest throughout that hot, thrilling

summer of 1911, which almost equalled in volume the noise that produced the downfall of M. Delcassé?" They set their lips and folded their cloaks tighter, while they sought refuge in an increasingly Roman conception of Catholicism. The growth of Modernism has had for one of its effects the growth of Romanism.

Now what should be the true attitude of the Church of England in this business?

In order to see what it means by its assertion that it teaches and accepts what the Catholic Church teaches and accepts, we must consider again what happened at the Reformation. As I have already indicated, the process through which the Anglican Church passed then did not work in it the fundamental changes that happened in other countries. But in the matter of authority and doctrine, what happened then is vital to our whole conception of Catholicism. The English theologians found themselves face to face with a system which had, so to speak, divinised itself. It had become so much a state, an institution, that it was blasphemy to question even its most recent ceremony. It had come to exist for its own sake, and whatever it did was right. For the voice of the Church was regarded not only as authoritative, but infallible. When an institution has reached this pitch it is impossible to appeal to first principles. It is the incarnate spirit of conservatism, and all reform is impossible. The measure of the difficulty is to be found in the distance to which Luther swung.

Protestantism generally, in its effort to recover

first principles, was compelled, of course, to set up a rival authority to the Pope, and they thought they found it in the Scripture. But, as a matter of fact, neither of the three great systems really made the Scriptures the sole test of doctrine. It was, in each case, the Scriptures as interpreted in a certain way. Luther valued the Scriptures because, and in so far as, they spoke of justification by faith alone. Calvin, by an appeal to Scripture, meant the Scripture glossed by the Institutes.

There were men in England who proposed solutions as radical and doctrinaire. They asserted that "the Scripture of God is in such sort the rule of human actions, that simply whatsoever we do, and are not by it directed thereunto, the same is sin," and their answer is the monumental work of Hooker. He saw, and all the great Englishmen saw, as all who have studied the history of the thing surely must see, that Scripture cannot be its own interpreter. They rejected the Pope, they equally rejected the Lutheran and the Calvinist interpretations. They answered in the words of Jewel: "We do openly and frankly set forth our faith wherein we stand, and show all that confidence which we have in Christ Jesu, to the intent all men may see what is our judgment of every part of christian religion, and may resolve with themselves whether the faith that they shall see confirmed by the words of Christ, by the writings of the apostles, by the testimonies of the catholic fathers, and by the examples of many ages, be but a certain rage of furious and mad men, and a conspiracy of

heretics." They set, that is to say, the authority of the primitive Church against the authority of the later. They went back to the first centuries for this test, and, in doing so, they found themselves among men soaked in the words and the ideas of Scripture. They found a Church to whose authority they could appeal, and yet, at the same time, they found its authority in no way contradicted that of Scripture, for the one depended on, and was the explicitation of, the other. "For at that time made the catholic fathers and bishops no doubt but that our religion might be proved out of the holy scriptures." [1]

Thus they were saved from the tyranny of private interpretation, and from dependence upon the logic of a master mind, while at the same time they possessed a criterion, which was the best touchstone of later developments. They found something to which their conscience and reason alike responded.

It was an appeal to authority, but it was the authority of a freely developing and mentally alive community, which at the same time had a means of testing in its hands. Is not this eminently wise? Is it not a conception of authority that will wear well?

Is it not, after all, just what Christ did when faced by the vast, corrupt religious system of his day, which yet was divine in origin? He was faced, as they were, by the beatification of convention. In order to pierce through to the truth,

[1] Jewel's *Apology*, p. 57.

which he never doubted lay underneath, he went back to the start. "From the beginning it was not so."

There are really two entirely different conceptions of what authority is. It might, from our point of view, be said that it is a conflict between authorities and authority. That Anglican catholicism appeals to the former and Roman to the latter. There are authorities in the sense that the word is used in a scientific book of history. They are the writings which give you the materials for forming a judgment. If they are sufficient, the judgment of all honest men who study them will come out pretty much the same. They give you a probability to which you can honestly assent. For their full understanding reason and conscience must co-operate. Authority in the singular is something which determines your every opinion in matters of faith, and of those matters of faith it is itself the chief.

Of course, the Anglican appeal meant more than that, for in the great, broad essentials it, too, tells you what to believe. But the things it does tell you are founded on an honest and free consensus. The Anglican is a corporate, almost a democratic view of authority; the Roman a governmental, or an autocratic. You see this in the consciousness of the reformers that they are carrying on the old conciliar tradition.

So Hooker says that "it is requisite that the Church of God here on earth have her laws of spiritual commerce between Christian nations;

laws by virtue whereof all churches may enjoy freely the use of those reverend, religious and sacred consultations, which are termed Councils General. A thing whereof God's own blessed Spirit was the author; a thing practised by the holy Apostles themselves . . . a thing never otherwise than most highly esteemed of, till pride, ambition and tyranny began, by factious and vile endeavours, to abuse that divine invention unto the furtherance of wicked purposes." And though Laud warns us that Councils are not infallible, yet we find in him, and in the other great divines, the same thought, that the keeper of the faith, the pillar and ground of truth, is the whole Church. The *consensus fidelium* is, after all, the governing authority. It is to that the Holy Spirit is promised.

It is sometimes felt that this return to primitive ages has about it something barbaric, or at any rate archæological, and we have to admit that the way in which it has been applied has at times smelt of the museum. But it certainly does not mean that it is cutting down the tree and sitting on its root, though that too often has been the result. It means a recognition that there is something normative in the first ages of the Church. And the whole tendency towards mere root-grubbing is kept in its proper place when the complementary thought of the consensus, to which I have been referring, is kept clearly in view. The Anglican position was woodenly and formally stated in a formal age. But that there was nothing freakish or accidental about it is seen when we compare

such a conception as that which Khomiakoff claimed had almost œcumenical sanction in Russia. "The Pope is greatly mistaken in supposing that we consider the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy to be the guardian of the dogma (of the Church). The case is quite different. The unvarying constancy and the unerring truth of Christian dogma does not depend upon any Hierarchical Order, it is guarded by the totality, by the whole people of the Church, which is the Body of Christ." [1]

The Anglican divines were vague in their knowledge of the East, but their learning in their day was immense, and they knew enough to know that they were building on a sound and wide foundation. They knew enough to know that they were not, in their conception of authority, doing something which found its only logical sequence in acceptance of the Holy See. They were reproached as Papists then, and we, their successors, are constantly told that that is our only logical resting-place. But, indeed, to accept their view of authority is to find the only preservative against false conceptions, whether autocratic or individualistic. As long as we remain true to this great idea and do not unconsciously substitute the Roman one for it, we are building for the future, even while we base ourselves on the past.

Our Roman brethren are right when they say to us that you must accept the Church as a whole. We reply, "That is what we humbly desire to do." But the whole which we view, and to which we

[1] Birkbeck, *Russia and the English Church*, p. 94.

bow, is larger than their obedience. It puts Truth above the institution, and draws its support from the Christian witness in all its forms.

The conciliar ideal is the testimony of the whole People of God. But it needs a patience and a wisdom which will trust to the Spirit that moves in man, because it is the colleague of his origin. For the true Catholic the antithesis "From heaven" or "Of men" is resolved.

"Authority," says Tyrrell, in the famous essay which bears that title, "is not an external influence streaming down from heaven, like a sunbeam through a cleft in the clouds, and with a finger of light singling out God's arbitrarily chosen delegates from the multitude, over and apart from which they are to stand as His Vice-gerents. Authority is something inherent in, and inalienable from, that multitude itself; it is the moral coerciveness of the Divine Spirit of Truth and Righteousness immanent in the whole, dominant over its several parts and members; it is the imperativeness of the collective conscience."

We believe in the Holy Spirit in the Church because we think that there the Spirit of man is by Divine act liberated from the worst consequences of evil. It remembers its heavenly origin, finds its true goal, and is making towards that perfect day when Christ shall come again with all his Saints, whose prayers even now are one of the main sources of our strength, and the secret of our life.

If we believe this, which I venture to think is the

dimly expressed truth of the Anglo-Catholic ideal, we shall not make that haste which comes of human impatience, nor shall we share the desire which W. G. Ward expressed when he said, "I should like a new Papal Bull every morning with my *Times* at breakfast."

We believe in the Church because we believe in humanity. The Holy Ghost is immanent in the Church. It is the same Spirit that moved on the face of the waters, and formed man in the Divine Image. He is the Spirit of Wisdom poured out upon all God's works, in measure upon all flesh, but without measure upon all who love him.

This, I say, is part of the essential spirit and permanent contribution of the Anglican communion, if only it is true to itself. It is what Tyrrell felt present in those "better-than-saints." To support the claim I will only adduce the words of one whom he does not happen to name. "There is in the world," says Hooker, "no kind of knowledge, whereby any part of truth is seen, but we justly account it precious; yea, that principal truth, in comparison whereof all other knowledge is vile, may receive from it some kind of light . . . to detract from the dignity whereof were to injury even God himself, who being that light which none can approach unto, hath sent out these lights whereof we are capable, even as so many sparkles resembling the bright fountain from which they rise." [1]

We believe, then, in the voice of the Church.

[1] *E. P.*, iv, viii, 9.

We find it expressed in the great Catholic Creeds. But we anticipate that God has more to teach us yet. We do not think that when these new revelations are faithfully and honestly examined, they will be found in any essential point contrary to what we have already learnt. We believe in development and growth in knowledge, but it is a development which flourishes in freedom, is learnt by labour, and makes demands on courage.

There is one question which falls to be considered here, though there is no time to deal with it properly, and that is the meaning of assent to the Creeds. The Apostles' and Nicene formulas are accepted as the expression of the Church's faith, and have been solemnly reaffirmed by the Lambeth Conferences. Their acceptance implies a desire to have no narrower basis than that of the universal, actual, historic Church. It signifies that the Spirit of Wisdom to which we own allegiance does not mean a reliance on vague generalities, but a wide adherence to firm realities. The Articles which thus quietly are placed in the background were admittedly a formula of comprehension, as is proper when burning questions of the day are dealt with, for in most cases the time will come when they will cease to burn. Are we, then, to say that the Creeds are of the same kind? It can hardly be asserted that they are. They represent the fundamentals, the credenda, without which Christianity becomes something else. And yet we have to remember three things with regard to them: (1) That they were the slow growth of centuries.

(2) That the Church was very reluctant to insert into them anything of the nature of interpretative clauses, and (3) that they represent the faith of the Church rather than of the individual. Their assertion is an essential of the life of the whole, their interpretation a matter for each member.

There is nothing new in this view. It is but the old Catholic caution. And, while we never ought to forget that there does come a point where the community may have to say such and such teaching is not in harmony with the faith, yet we shall always approach the demand for closer authoritative definition with the question addressed by Sibour, the Archbishop of Paris, to Pius IX: "Unde vero haec definiendi voluptas?"[1] It is useful to remember, too, the warning that Newman wrote to Ward: "Pardon me if I say that you are making a Church within a Church, as the Novatians of old did within the Catholic pale, and as, outside the pale, the Evangelicals of the Establishment. As they talk of 'vital religion' and 'vital doctrines,' and will not allow that their brethren 'know the Gospel,' or are Gospel preachers, unless they profess the small shibboleths of their own sect, so you are doing your best to make a party in the Catholic Church."[2]

The Church of England, we cannot doubt, will follow this path of insisting on essentials for Christendom as a whole, while chary of drawing the line

[1] Cf. Nielsen, *History of the Papacy in the Nineteenth Century*, vol. ii, p. 192.

[2] Wilfrid Ward, *W. G. Ward and the Catholic Revival*, p. 267.

tighter than the Catholic Church has done, and not expecting of individuals what is only possible in its fulness for the whole mystical Body. She will remember the words of Hammond that a catholic—that is, a firm and wide—foundation is necessary to the planting of the Christian temple, yet it cannot be supposed that every article is needed for the reducing of each single person.

For this line is, after all, but the Catholic temper which was the mark of the Church in its greatest days, whether primitive or mediæval. Gnosticisms, strange doctrines of the atonement, predestination, non-miraculous Christianities—the Church's path is strewn with them, though the only sign of their presence are queer gravestones, which the curious spend their ingenuity in deciphering until such time as, by the natural process of action and reaction, their day comes round once more. Then the question is faced again in its new setting, and the Church, reinvigorated by the truths that they contain, goes calmly on its way.

The principles of Anglicanism are the principles of the Catholic Church. All that they need is to be shorn of their provincialism, to emerge into that larger air which is the breath of the universal body. We have to allow for the witness of the whole, to learn to appreciate that "educated sense of fitness"[1] which the truest members of Christ have learnt, wherever they may be and with whatever excess or defect.

If we really believe in the whole we shall not will-

[1] Cf. W. Spens, *Belief and Practice.*

ingly allow to escape anything that is pure or holy or of good report. Catholic principles make men cautious lest to-day should kill to-morrow, but they do not mean that we should all be living in the middle of last week. They will be firm and clear, for they take their stand on those things in which the experience of all Christians, Orthodox and Catholic, Greek and Roman, have found of value, but they demand that, rooted on that base, there should be growth and expansion and new knowledge such as the Spirit of Wisdom can give.

And the first essential to a practical increase in these principles is for the bishops to forget that they are shepherds and learn to be foremen, to look upon it as their duty to understand, to recapitulate, to represent the voice of the whole body of Christ, to cease to be rulers and to become presidents, organs of the Holy Ghost, because they are channels through which the Christian People both discovers and expresses its own mind, which, in its totality, and under the Divine guidance, must be the mind of Christ.

CHAPTER V

THE HOPE OF THE FUTURE

When we pray, "Thy Kingdom come," what we pray for principally and absolutely, though perhaps only implicitly, is the increase of the Communion of Saints. What we pray for explicitly, though subordinately and conditionally, is the furtherance of God's visible Kingdom on earth, the establishment of those social conditions which make for the increase of inward religion. Chief among those conditions is that divine institution, the creation of Christ's spirit, which exists explicitly for the defence of the religious interest, namely, the visible Church, the special organ and embodiment of the spiritual Church, the earthly representative, counterpart, and sacrament of the communion of Saints.—George Tyrrell, *Lex Credendi*, p. 175. Longmans, 1906.

CHAPTER V

THE HOPE OF THE FUTURE

We have been considering the Anglican communion under various aspects. We have thought of it as sharing in the Divine foundation and continuous life of the People of God, as part of that great priesthood of humanity which is the Catholic Church. We went on to see that, while holding fast to this essential unity, the English people was forced by the tyranny of corruption, which had become more and more involved in the Roman government of western Christendom, to make a bold national experiment in the way of religion, whereby the ancient fabric and faith of Catholicism were retained, but the freedom which comes from new life was welcomed. It is this combination of conservatism and progress, of authority and liberty, which led me to speak of the English Church as, from the human point of view, the most characteristic product of the English spirit. This impression is confirmed when we return, as we did in the third lecture, to the questions of the Faith. Here its ideal, however far it may fall short of it, is a candid but firm hold of the ancient credenda combined with a calm courage in face of searching criticism, which is neither burked nor abused, not because

the Church wishes to make accommodations with the world, but because orthodoxy is its aim, and orthodoxy demands the Spirit of Wisdom, which will teach Christendom in the future as it has done in the past.

These conceptions, I believe, are of the essence of the true character of the Anglican communion. I do not mean to assert that they are consciously held by all its members. Nor do I mean to say that there is any official statement in which they can be found to be precisely formulated. But I am persuaded that a sympathetic study of her history will reveal that they represent the spirit which slowly and gradually finds expression—the spirit which, when essentials are attacked, will in the end make itself felt.

We must remember that it has had great difficulties to contend against. It was only by the support of the State that it was able in the end to throw off that foreign yoke which masqueraded as the Divine government of the Church, though, in fact, it was an institution very much of this world. We need not be ashamed of this assistance, though we certainly ought to reject any false claims which amount to the exchange of one human tyranny for another. We need not be ashamed because, in fact, this action was the expression of the determination of a group of Christian people to be free in its exercise of the Catholic religion. But we have to recognise, as we look out into the future, what exactly are the difficulties from which we are suffering. A recognition of these will help us to see

both why we have not accomplished what we might have done, and also the reason of the prevailing ignorance on the part of our own members as to the nature of their vocation.

That vocation is, I venture to say, an even greater one than that of the British empire itself. It is one which is as characteristic of the British spirit, and is as little understood by the great mass of our fellow-countrymen. A widespread ignorance as to the meaning of the empire does not, however, induce those who have seen the ideal to abandon it, but rather to devote themselves with greater energy to the work of making it known and understood and loved. Nor should we, who believe with all our heart and soul in the Divine vocation of our Church, be led into a faithless abandonment of the vision, either by shrinking from the labour which it involves, or by substituting other ideals which make its realisation impossible.

Just as groups of workers have sprung up throughout the Dominions intensely believing in the providential call of the empire, and, because they so believe, determined to study and to understand what it involves, and, moreover, by their united labour to produce throughout its length and breadth a clearer and a common mind, which shall be based, not on party but on honest investigation, so we need that all the branches of the Anglican communion patiently investigate the problems which face the whole of Christendom, appraise and understand the forces which it has at its disposal, and learn, in dependence upon the Holy Ghost,

what is the contribution we have to make to that union and triumph of the People of God, which is the insistent aspiration held out to us by the Divine Wisdom Himself.

"He giveth without measure to those that love Him."

We must start by recognising the great gifts which he has already given to Orthodoxy and to the Roman Obedience. But we must recognise as faithfully what He has given to us too. Nor must we blind our eyes to all those things—for they, too, are great—which have been granted to faithful men and women who have organised themselves into religious communities apart from those broad lines of Catholicism which have been retained by the three great representatives of historic Christendom. For Protestantism has its share in the supernatural gifts of Divine grace.

It is in this wide context that we must study our own vocation. Churches, like countries, think first of their own interests. This is probably necessary in order to maintain their integral existence. Many times it is an almost blind struggle for life. The human units, of which each is composed, are hardly aware of the ideal for which they are fighting. But the Mind that guides them knows, and the hand that is laid upon them is fulfilling a purpose that that Mind has ordained. The day arrives when existence is more or less secure, and above the battle there appears a light which illuminates the sky. Then each country and each church has to ask itself, as does a man who is rescued from

a sinking ship: "Why have I been saved? It must be for some good cause, for some unseen purpose to which I can contribute, some common good to which I can offer the talents committed to me." When that dawns it is the regeneration of countries, and of churches, and of men. For they perceive that there is an order in things, which is none other than the earnest of the kingdom which comes down from heaven.

The countries of the world are, through the bitter pains of travail, being re-born. They are learning that they stand or fall together, that they are parts of one whole, that they are brethren, and that it is God's will that they should live as such. But this great faith must be born of faith, and grow by faith. It cannot rest on common interest alone, nor on the advantages of mutual trade. It can only permanently live if it is firmly based upon an acknowledgment of God's will and the realisation of Divine vocation. What power can inspire mankind with this great truth except the Christian Church? And how can the Christian Church fulfil its purpose unless it itself be one, so that the bond of a common Christianity is ever, as it were, speaking to men the old reminder, "Sirs, ye are brethren."

For this it is needed that Christendom be re-born. It must slough off what is transitory and hindering. It must look again with the eyes of its Master, and learn, in the adoration of its worship, the majesty and power and love of the Triune Godhead. To do this it is not necessary to deny its past, or to

repudiate what the Holy Spirit has taught it. But it must strive to live more in that Eternal World, where to the Heavenly Wisdom, whose eyes are everywhere, Past, Present and Future are all one, the choric song which, taught of angels, man sings to his Maker.

The Church has an Eternal Gospel, and a faith which, because it is rooted in the supersensual world, does not change as far as its essential elements are concerned. To this its historic order and its agelong rites, gathering up as they do the instincts of all faithful pre-Christian worship, bear an unvarying witness that is of inestimable value, and can never die.

There is an unchanging substance, though the emphasis on its different parts differs in different ages. It is a living substance, not a dead deposit. And so it has fashioned a body for itself, and for that body clothes. The body persists even as does the soul, the clothes wear out and are changed. To some extent they change with the fashions of the times, and yet, even with the clothes, the general outline remains the same, for the body they have to fit persists.

There are some who tell us that we have arrived at a state so pure and hardy that we can dispense with all vesture, while others go further and would bid us live like a disembodied spirit. But as we watch their efforts we are painfully reminded that we are still living in time, even though it be shot through with eternity; and we remember, too, that though in the Resurrection much is changed (they

neither marry nor are given in marriage), yet we have the highest Christian authority for believing, as the poet says—

> "Eternal form shall still divide
> The eternal soul from all beside."

And so we believe that the form of Christ's Church has, too, about it something that is Divine, that it is a heavenly body.

But it adapts and changes its clothes, and that it is able to do so is one of its great strengths. In each age the organisation of the Church, while remaining fundamentally unaltered, has been influenced, and rightly influenced, by the governmental and political conceptions of the day. First the synagogue, then the clubs of the empire, then the empire itself, then feudalism, then the national states, then the centralisation of authority, all these have left their mark on parts of the Church. The results are not of the essence. There are certain unchanging things represented, the general and necessary hang of the garments, as it were. These are the episcopate and priesthood on the one hand, and the corporate witness of the whole body of the faithful on the other.

What is the particular shape that we ought to be aiming at? What the Church needs is a unity which is based on orthodoxy, an orthodoxy which shall not be imposed from above, but which rests upon the gathered-up experience of the whole, and is acknowledged by a free consensus.

The world is in the grip of two antagonists, who represent two opposed notions of authority. On

the one hand there is the idea of centralised government imposing civilisation, knowledge and art on all those whom it can compel to recognise its sway. Its avowed object is unity, but unity based on, expressed in uniformity, and treating as potential enemies all who are not within its fold. On the other there is the same ideal of unity, but unity that is to be reached by the free adhesion of individuals and groups, a unity that will not despise uniformity, where it is the inevitable expression of the common mind—a unity for the establishment of which those who seek it will be willing to forego many cherished practices and private peculiarities, but one which, so far from being frightened at variety, will love and cherish true individuality. It will not shrink from what seems a slow and muddling and expensive process, if that be necessary to real understanding, but it will labour unremittingly for the intelligent recognition, on the part of all concerned, of the essential conditions of success. It will be a unity in which all will find the realisation of their true selves, the unity of the sons of one father, not the common service of slaves.

The Anglican Church in the past has, like other religious communities, thought too much of its own interest and security. It was, as I have suggested, necessary that it should do so. Mere Anglicanism was its chrysalis stage. It has now arrived at the time when it must consider what it can give, not what it can get.

It is easier for it to take up this standpoint in

that it has never claimed to be the whole Catholic Church. It has been conscious, if dimly, of a larger Christianity, of which it was a part. And so it is peculiarly its province to offer with faith, but with humility, to the other great branches of the Church a large and liberal conception of Catholicism. The obedience of Rome and the Churches which look with reverence to Constantinople have both claimed, and do still claim, that they, and they alone, are the whole true Church. We have not to allow ourselves to be bemused by the magic of their claims, while frankly recognising their enormous strength and the permanent value of their contributions.

We shall find, as we examine them, that there is more possibility of understanding with Orthodoxy than with Romanism. Because, though in outward expression and habit of mind the former seems at a greater distance from us than the latter, as East is East and West is West, and Englishmen have so much of the Latin in them after all; yet Romanism places the pyramid on its point, while Orthodoxy plants it firmly on its base, and that one which is capable of infinite extension. Russia builds the institution on the faith, while Rome makes the faith depend upon the institution. And when we come to consider the institution itself, we find that in the former synodical government is the ideal, however far it may have departed therefrom under the influence of the State, and it has always had, as I have already pointed out, clearly before it the faith of the whole as the ultimate authority.

The Anglican Church, then, has to learn to look on its own principles as principles of inclusion, not of exclusion. It will not be afraid of ideals, and so will refuse to give up the thought of unity. But it will not refuse to face facts, and so will recognise that the largest and, in many ways, the most important parts of Christendom are the old parts, those which can be subsumed under the general head of Catholicism. In spite of grave moral defects, which have, in the course of centuries, eaten their way into these systems, they still have, as far as faith and religion are concerned, a secret and unfailing mystery which satisfies the needs of man's soul. They are other-worldly, and therefore form the necessary foundation. We shall rejoice in our fundamental kinship with them, and resolve that none of the great goods they possess shall be lost in the final synthesis.

But there are two classes of problems with which it is not easy for them to deal. (*a*) There are, first, the questions raised by philosophy and criticism. Here the clothes worn by the old Churches are of an antiquated cut, and hamper their movements, though those who venture along this path, even with caution, find that study only confirms the existence of a genuine and recognisably Catholic stream. They need not fear, if their chief interests are Christian truth and Catholic religion, and not just the bolstering up of an institution. Batiffol's *L'Eglise Naissante* has as much to be said for itself as Reinach's *Orpheus*.

(*b*) The application of Christian principle to

social life. Here, again, though Catholicism, in its attitude towards marriage, is guarding, perhaps, man's greatest treasure, and doing splendid work by its endeavour to secure a Christian education, yet it fails as a force for bringing Christian principles to bear on the social and political relations of man's life. It is, perforce, too much concerned with its own maintenance as an institution. There is a growing recognition that these problems must be brought under the influence of an opinion guided and informed by Christianity. For this we have to look to that diffused, very often queer and perverted, but indubitably, on the whole, free and honest religious feeling, which gets its strength from Protestantism.

With all these things, old and new, religious, intellectual, political, the Anglican communion has links by virtue of its history. Synthesis, the harmonisation of opposites, the product of what its enemies call stupidity, its possessors common sense, is as much the characteristic of the English temper as it was of that of the old imperial Latin race. The spirit of refusing to give up contraries if they seem to be true, which we find, *e. g.*, in the Athanasian Creed, is the spirit which guides Englishmen in all walks of life, whether it be politics, or science, or historical study, and should qualify him to understand and to develop Catholic theology. But he must insist that black is to go with white and not mingle into grey.

Here, then, are our opportunity and our human potentialities. Shall we be able to rise to them? We

seem to be called to contribute to, and to search for, a real synthesis, to aim at a Christendom which is genuinely liberal because it is really Catholic, and genuinely Catholic because it is really liberal. This synthesis will not be a universal Anglo-catholicism. We have not got to make it, but to contribute to it, and this we do best by retaining the larger vision, and at the same time being true to ourselves.

I venture to think that it is not wild to prophesy that religion will matter more to the world after the war than it did before, and this not so much because of any revival of the trenches (as to which I can say nothing, because I know nothing), but because these great happenings are themselves largely the exhibition of a supersensual faith, and, moreover, they must drive men and women, whether in the field or at home, to ponder deeply *de rerum natura*, and to ask what are the ultimate forces and sanctions in the world. Many, we may hope, will be led to see that a stable law and permanent order can only be built on the recognition of the Truth of God and his revelation of himself and his purposes.

We must pray, and we may trust, when that moment arrives, that they will be led to see how noble, how truly national and how truly human a part the Englishman's Church is called upon to play in bringing home these truths to the sons of men. They will then rise in their faith and demand that the shackles which at present hinder its free course and impede its witness be

struck off, and that no longer is it allowed to be the greatest but the most misunderstood thing in our inheritance.

What, then, will a man demand?

Surely he will demand of himself, and of all other of her sons and daughters, that they should be loyal. No country was ever freed save by the loyalty of its children. It was because they believed in it and loved it that they were so determined that it should be delivered, at whatever cost to themselves. They will not talk blandly about "the Church's failure and some remedies." They will think rather of their own failure to recognise her true nature, and remember that it is they who have contributed to her being left wounded and bleeding by the wayside. It was because they passed by on the other side, worshipping the popular cry, and accepting the popular valuation, rather than listening to the immemorial call.

They will seek the true beauty of her soul, and recognise the fair form of her body, perceiving that the clothes that had hidden her from their gaze were not the true old garments which had the splendour and fragrance of antiquity, but some in which more modern hands had dressed her up. These it was which the passage of time had made absurd, just because they were not old, but merely old-fashioned. He will be humbly and sincerely grateful to her for preserving for him the genuine inspiration of the Spirit, and the sacramental grace of her Lord and Master. This is the priceless boon, which only impels him the more to make

her fortunes less unworthy of her position in the Catholic Church.

What we need, then, is loyalty to the Church of England as an integral and genuine part of the Catholic Church, in which we believe we have a part, by virtue of, not in spite of, our membership in her. We must cease to apologise for the Church of England, for most of the faults of which people complain are due to her officials and members, not herself. It is we who have failed, if failure there has been, not she. We have failed through ignorance, or perversity, or timidity, or worldliness, to allow her light to shine.

I think the failure is enormously exaggerated. The teachers of the Church have been vague and chaotic, but a real and humble faith in God and his Son Jesus Christ is almost universal among the English people, none the less there because it finds it difficult to express itself. But it can be proved by the fact that mockery of holy things does not pay in England. Personally, I believe this to be truer than it was a hundred years ago. To-day a Labour Member of Parliament can get up in the House of Commons and say that in our public affairs we must be guided by the laws of true morality, and that, by the laws of true morality, he means the law of Jesus Christ, and be heard with respectful attention by a house filled to overflowing, at a critical moment, when feeling was running high. Again, it was an English representative, Keir Hardie, who astonished his brother Socialists at an international congress in Belgium,

by bearing in the procession a banner bearing just the words, Jesus Christ.

Or take the Boy Scouts. In England they would never have had a chance of success if they had not placed first amongst their rules Duty to God. One does not wish, in a spirit of pharisaism, to compare oneself with one's friends. But it is equally true that, had the Eclaireurs de France had such a rule their progress would have been out of the question, though the fact was, as I know, a matter of the deepest regret to many of the Frenchmen who were most keenly interested in the movement.

I cite these little incidents, not in a spirit of unction, but as straws which indicate the direction of the wind. Now surely it is only just to claim that, in the production of this state of things, the Church of England has played a very important part. Would it have been the same without it? I believe myself, at any rate, that the strong and sober sense of duty of the Englishman, the spirit that does things without making a fuss—a spirit which really, when analysed, is just that of the man in the Gospels who, when he had done all, regarded himself as an unprofitable servant—is due, in very large part, to the temper of mind which is present as an active force in the English Church, and finds expression in that admirable and characteristic manual of the Christian religion, the Church Catechism. Surely it has never been better exhibited than now. I do not wish to deny other valuable influences—the wonderful Presbyterian Church in Scotland especially, and also English

Nonconformity. I only wish to plead against exaggeration, and to beware that, when we set to work to reconstruct the future, we start from facts, and base our edifice on the achievements of the past.

Religion is duty; that is the voice of the English Church. It is a voice that she learnt from the historic Catholic Church. All that I am asking for is implicit in the Church Catechism. The great need of England just now is that we should try to make it explicit, and to put it into practice.

Let us grant that the vagueness of the nineteenth-century Church has had a value, and one that we must not lose. It has made for the precious grace of liberty. But we need to enthrone beside it the old conception of duty. Side by side—duty and liberty—they should be our watchwords.

What, then, do we need, if the Englishman is to find in his Church something which calls out a sense of duty, even while it sets him free?

(1) A clearer and more intelligible expression of what the mind of the Church is. This, I think, can only come by the setting up of some body, which is representative of the mind of the whole society, such *e. g.* as is adumbrated in the Church and State Report. But while that is in the making, and even, to some extent, when it is made, it is the duty of the episcopate as a whole to give to the Church, from time to time, guidance on faith and morals. And when they speak, they must do so in no narrow or provincial way, but as remembering that they are only part of the larger whole of

Christendom. I do not think we need fear that the result of such expression will be either extravagant or narrow when we study the Encyclicals of the Lambeth Conferences, whose tone and temper have been surely admirable. And, in passing, let us notice that, as so often, the Church has been ahead of the State by many years in discerning a means of expressing its common mind. We, in the Church, have for years had such a Conference as the empire is feeling after now, and, inspired by the genius of Bishop Montgomery, there was erected last time a more popular assembly of the whole Anglican demos, to sit side by side with the upper and more responsible house.

(2) We need a more thorough and uniform training of our clergy. The members of the Church, and especially its ministers, must be made to learn that theology is the *Scientia Scientiarum*, the queen of sciences, the most difficult, just because it is the unifier of all forms of knowledge. We must see that the average of the students is at least as high, intellectually and spiritually, as those who are trained, for example, by the Society of the Sacred Mission.

(3) We must have more uniformity in our worship. The revolt against it was necessary, because it was a rebellion against the uniformity of convention. But it is no gain that its place should be taken by personal taste and individual ignorance, still less by the deliberate aping of other communions.

And this uniformity must be founded on know-

ledge and experience. We have our own standards of worship. What they involve has been drawn out by the patient labour of our most qualified scholars. Yet the result of their work is but dimly realised by the official Church. And so bishops forbid incense, while they cheerfully allow Stations of the Cross. They suffer devotions before the reserved Sacrament, and forbid the clerk to read the epistle. We must get rid of the dogma that episcopal orders confer infallible liturgical knowledge. The only hope is to be found in a wisely chosen Congregation of Rites.

This is the more necessary as the movement towards making the Eucharist the principal service of Sunday, a movement which is the outcome of a profoundly Christian instinct, grows and gathers force. The blessing of the archbishops will no doubt assist it on its way. But it is not sufficient to stop there. Practical guidance is needed on the part of the episcopate if the deplorable mistakes which have been made in the past are not to be ingrained everywhere. Sobriety, dignity and common sense have been the marks of the best liturgical periods, and our scholars have shown us that a loyal following of our English standards and traditions provide us with a service which is not only in tune with the English temper, but a genuine outcome of the Catholic spirit.

If the great rite of Christendom is to be our central act of worship, as it plainly should be, it must be recognisably the same in every church. The present chaos is utterly confounding to the

plain man. It does not in the least mean that it need be of the same elaborateness everywhere. But such ceremonial as there is should follow roughly the same lines, and whatever be the variations they should be permissible and recognised variations. To start with, the rite itself, as we have it in the book, should be treated, as it deserves, with the greatest respect. And an important element of that respect is that it should be clearly heard. Openness and intelligibility are ineradicable marks of our liturgy. There are revisions which a growing body of informed opinion is demanding, *e. g.* that the canon of the mass be redeemed from accentuating late mediæval notions as to the moment of consecration, as at present; a change which could be made by including the prayer of oblation with the present consecration prayer and adding thereto the "Our Father."

But these revisions must not be made on the authority of individual priests, or even bishops. Still less should it be possible for individual bishops to authorise other forms of the Eucharist, however beautiful or venerable, unless for some special occasion one of the other offices employed in other parts of the Anglican communion be allowed. The position of the celebrant, and his vesture in the traditional dress, neither of them things having any special doctrinal significance, except as a proclamation of the unity of Christendom, are happily becoming more and more agreed points.

The use of music, again, calls aloud for guidance and reform. And the principle underlying such

action should be that which breathes in the Injunctions of Queen Elizabeth, issued in 1559: "That there be a modest and distinct song so used in all parts of the Common Prayers in the Church, that the same may be as plainly understanded as if it were read without singing." [1]

The authorities have lately been exercised, and rightly exercised, by the organised efforts of certain people to make the reserved Sacrament a centre of worship. It is a serious matter, for it is a practice which is very far from having Catholic sanction behind it. It seems likely, indeed, to mark a momentous stage in the history of the Church of England. And yet it is, outside the ordinary worship of the Church, an extra. But every day the official and authorised services of the Church are being treated in the most high-handed way, both by omission and interpolation, without any apparent effort being made to regulate the offenders. Surely this is really a more serious matter, for they are the things to which we have all sworn obedience, and they are the staple on which the faithful are built up. The result has been a marked decrease in the sense of moral responsibility. If liturgical worship were properly regulated, it would be all the easier to deal with developments of an extra-liturgical character which may be unwise.

And so for all these reasons I feel clear that what the Church needs is a Congregation of Rites which

[1] Frere, *Visitation Articles and Injunctions*, vol. iii, p. 28, Alcuin Club Collections.

would supply the bishops with a policy and a positive ideal wherewith to guide their clergy, the majority of whom are perfectly loyal, and only desiring wise leading. This, moreover, is precisely the kind of matter in which leadership is the function of the episcopate. The cry is often heard that what we need is elasticity. It is a right one, if it means that the details of our liturgical services should not be rigidly the same everywhere. They never were in the great days of worship. But the underlying principles must be the same, and of these the most important, from a Catholic point of view, is loyalty to authority. And, further, the outward presentation must wear recognisably the same aspect.

The demand for elasticity is even more right if it means that over and above our liturgical services we should have other common acts of prayer of a free character. There is nothing more needed if we are to win those who are at present outside the influence of organised Christianity. We want additional services which shall be as plain and direct as possible, where those who do not know how may learn to pray, and the less liturgical we make them the better. And one feature of them should certainly be preaching which shall appeal both to the head and to the heart, and shall treat Christianity as one of the real problems of the day, or rather as their solution. There are many who simply do not know what thoughtful Christians hold, or indeed what Christianity means. They are not ready for the sacraments, and they will still

less be won by offices, however crudely procrustean a method be applied to them. Matins and evensong are splendid if you can say them every day, but they become the most deadly of deadly fare when turned into the most "occasional" of "occasional offices."

The Church must continue and indeed go forward along the path of offering to Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, the most dignified and splendid worship which the Spirit inspires her to. She must clothe it with all conceivable beauty and honour. It must be in every way worthy of its great Object, and into it must be poured the richest treasures of human art. The idea of an acknowledgment of God which shall be public, corporate, grand and spacious is one that is profoundly Christian and Catholic, and certainly does not become any the less desirable or true as education advances.

But the Church has also a manward, a missionary activity, and that has to be pursued in an entirely different fashion. The trouble is that we have so often confused the two, and so we have tried to turn our cathedrals into parish churches, and our parish churches into cathedrals. As a matter of fact, probably both activities—the Godward and the manward—should go on in both, though in different ways. But whether it be cathedral or parish church, those in charge should be clear which it is they are aiming at, and not confuse the two into an unpalatable jumble. The missionary activity has always as its object to get men to understand and love the Godward activity. But

it is not the same thing, and its method must be different.

Our fourth need is a radical overhauling of the whole methods of Church finance. If tithe and glebe are to be retained—a questionable advantage—at any rate their administration ought to be entirely changed and placed in the hands of either a central board like the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, or an organisation in each diocese. There may be arguments for retaining episcopal palaces, though they have not found very persuasive defenders so far,—the arguments, save those of Dr. Headlam, having a distinctly worldly ring. But there is almost everything to be said for getting rid of most of the rectories and vicarages. They are a burden to their inhabitants and a monumental misrepresentation of the priestly office.

Our fifth need, and the recognition of it among members of the Church of England is one of the surest signs of hope for the future, is that the Christian message should be interpreted in such terms as will show it to be a solution of those social problems which are the real work of to-day. "My kingdom is not of this world" remains true for all time. But those who believe in that kingdom can never rest till this order of things in which we now live is as far as possible reduced to the pattern that has been seen in the Mount.

It is not the business of the Church to express opinions as to the technical details of international conflict or economic struggles. They have, like every other form of human activity, their own

economy. But it is the duty of the Church to keep clear before the public mind the moral principles involved, and not only the general outlines of morality, but also the way to apply these in particular instances, where the line of action to be adopted can clearly be decided on ethical grounds. An example of such an application is to be found in the assertion that a living wage for workers is the first charge on an industry.

But if the Church is to carry out its true mission, as a leader, how is its voice to get heard? Is it by the activities of groups of clever people who devote themselves to these studies? Such work is essential, and a great deal more of that kind of knowledge is required. But the Church as a whole ought to have an opinion and guidance to give. If there are some who shrink from such corporate pronouncements, this fact may be commended to their consideration. The trade union movement has produced one remarkable result. It may almost be said to have invented a new kind of Englishman. It has evolved a type of man who thinks corporately, who has learnt to weigh what he says, and to remember that he is speaking for others. This in itself represents an enormous advance in education. Men who have passed through this mental and moral discipline naturally demand of the Church that it should have a considered opinion and a method of expressing it.

What they find is that popular bishops and other officials get up and, in what we are accustomed to regard as the true British way, air their views

- See note on page 15.

is fundamentally God's creation all the same. The Christian is prepared to find in the facts of this world a discipline to be borne, but in the evil that is in the world an enemy to be engaged in a ceaseless warfare, and one of his greatest difficulties is to know what is discipline to be borne, and what is evil to be crushed. Here, surely, the knowledge of his comrades should come to his assistance.

My task is done. In the business of parochial life, increased by the pressure of the war, which has offered a new opportunity to those who believe in the gospel, it is difficult to find time to get clear the true lessons of one's experience. But all that I have seen under these conditions has only intensified my conviction that Christ and his Church is the one Hope of the world, that we are at the dawn of great days, and that in those days our beloved Ecclesia Anglicana has a great vocation, if we, her sons, believe in her and love her. To her, then, I offer my homage, not only for what she has, amid great difficulties, done for my country and myself, and those many other sons who have, in the last two years, given their lives, because they were inspired by her spirit, but also, and most of all, because of what she may, in God's Providence, do for Christendom and that New World, which is none other than the Kingdom of Heaven.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX ON THE RESERVATION OF THE EUCHARIST

The controversy over the reserved Sacrament is an excellent example of some of the contentions made in the lectures. Devotions before the tabernacle, and in some cases exposition, having been vigorously pushed forward in certain quarters during the war, some guidance by the bishops, acting as a body, was plainly necessary. Those of the province of Canterbury dealt with the matter by unanimously reaffirming a rubric which they had agreed to insert in a revised Prayer Book. It was to the effect that reservation of the Eucharist was to be allowed for communicating the sick, and "for no other purpose whatsoever."

Those who desire to be true to that Vincentian canon, "*quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*," which has been the guiding principle of Anglo-catholicism, will surely welcome such corporate action, and the more that the line adopted definitely recognises that there is such a thing as Catholic custom. The universal usage of the Church from, at any rate, the second century has been to communicate the sick from the reserved Eucharist. The Church of England had a perfect right to issue an Order for the Communion of the

sick which required celebration at the sick man's house, and it may be observed that it was abuses connected with the Sacrament that led to this course being taken. But practical experience has shown that the older and universal method is needed as well. And so on practical grounds a very large number of parish priests will welcome the proposal.

But its theological value is great, too. For reservation implies acceptance of that supernatural view of the consecrated elements which is the common faith of the historic churches of East and West. It will be recognised as such by the Orthodox in Russia and elsewhere. They will see that we are not Lutherans, and they will be all the more inclined to accept our orthodoxy because the decision is safeguarded by the denial of any other use whatsoever. For the extra-liturgical cultus of the Eucharist is confined to one part of the Church only, and that the one with which the English branch saw good reason to break, just because it was laying down, as conditions of Catholicism, novel doctrines and practices which had not the sanction of Christendom as a whole. These devotions are a clear example of something which cannot be held to be Catholic,[1] unless Roman and Catholic are convertible terms. Now, the fundamental contention of the English Church is that they are not. If they are, our whole existence as a Church is an absurdity.

But some who do not claim that these practices

[1] See note at end.

have Catholic custom behind them, yet point to the weighty fact, as it appears to them, that while at first they were opposed by authority in Western Christendom, at length authority gave way, and "to-day there is not a single Roman Catholic bishop, from the pope downwards, who will say a word against it." [1]

But it may be quite fairly pointed out that the doctrine of the Infallibility of the Pope has had precisely the same history. There is certainly now no Roman Catholic bishop, from the Pope downwards, who would not be swift to assert its necessity, though at the Vatican Council, Strossmayer, one of the greatest of them, declared adherence to the new dogma to be the best way to destroy the Infallibility of the Church.

This thought may also be commended to those who regard it as an injustice to interfere with any devotional practice of Western Christendom. Exposition of the reserved Eucharist is no less a devotional practice of Western Christendom than is the custom of praying before the tabernacle, and no doubt those who drew up the memorial, from which the above words were quoted, were well aware that their threat included that extension of the practice, though it may be doubted whether the thousand clergy who signed it realised the point.

It is for exposition that Mr. Underhill is really pleading—"the implications of the doctrine of the

[1] Underhill, "Extra-Liturgical Devotions," *English Church Review*, April 1916, p. 164.

Real Presence." His main argument reveals the motive of many earnest men, and one that does not necessarily involve the persuasion that everything that Rome does is right. He says, "What we are looking for is some form of devotion which will arouse enthusiastic prayer; there can be no doubt at all that the Roman Church has found it, and nothing but our craven and superstitious fear of Rome prevents us from trying to understand how these great things are done." Surely this is an argument that does more credit to the heart than to the head, and indeed really exposes the inherent weakness of much modern religion. It is not only the Roman obedience that is beset by the idea that the business of the Church is to provide tricks for stirring up devotion. The same argument is employed amongst ourselves as a justification of sentimental hymns and maudlin tunes. But emotion is not necessarily devotion. Rather is true devotion the flower that springs from the root of duty. And it is especially abhorrent to many of us that the Blessed Sacrament should be torn from its context and used for this kind of purpose. For the sacraments were given to us to be used as part of our duty to God, and for his glory, and, it may be added, according to his revealed will, not to be turned into stimuli to devotion.

The notion that in religion we are to give the public what it wants is separated by a wide chasm from the teaching of Him who was the Wisdom of God Incarnate. He fled the crowds, or spoke to them in parables. But this notion has eaten deeply

into the Roman system. A lay friend of mine, a thoughtful and devout member of the Church of England, was once travelling in Spain. Turning into a cathedral on a Sunday, he heard an eloquent sermon from one of the canons, who exhorted a vast congregation to take all their troubles to our Lady, and they would find their solution there. The next day, being interested in architecture, he made a closer inspection of the cathedral under the guidance of the canon who had preached on the previous day. Their conversation fell upon theology. The canon seemed surprised at the extent of my friend's faith, and at length asked what was his belief. To which he got for reply the Apostles' Creed. "What," he exclaimed, "you don't mean to say you believe all that!" "Yes, certainly I do; don't you?" "Good gracious, no!" "But," said the Englishman in amazement, "I heard you tell the people yesterday that they were to take all their troubles to Mary. Now that goes far beyond my faith." "Oh, yes," came the answer, "we say that, because we think it good for the people. They like to hear it." That is the nemesis of trusting to devotions as stimuli.

The cause of the Reformation, on its religious side, was the forgetfulness of first principles, and we are still suffering from the reaction to which that forgetfulness gave rise. No kind of principle which can be called Anglo-catholic has been advanced, unless it be an Anglican principle that in order to avoid a schism everybody is to be allowed to believe or disbelieve, do or not do, just what

seems good in their own eyes. Father H. P. Bull[1] says he is pleading for liberty for loyal men. But who is to be the judge of this loyalty? Not the bishops, for they are smartly told that unless they do as the memorialists bid they will be disobeyed. He seems to regard any appeal to the law of the Church as intellectual fencing, though, strangely enough, he passes at once into an historical disquisition which is very well described by those words. Apparently he is prepared to let each man be the judge of his own loyalty. But supposing his judgment leads him to the institution of evening Communion, or the denial of the value of the fast before reception. Is the Superior prepared for liberty then? And, if not, what argument can he effectively bring against it except that appeal to Catholic custom which is the Anglican inheritance, and just as effective against extra-liturgical devotions.

But some of us realised fully for the first time, and with something of a shock, how far the abandonment of principle in favour of giving people what they want had gone, when we read the Bishop of London's speech in Convocation. The whole argument of it is fear of numbers. Apparently, if only a group be sufficiently compact, organised and insolent, those solemnly charged with the government of the society are instantly to surrender. The argument adduced by the Bishops of London and Birmingham that they wished to avoid schism

[1] Cf. "Reservation—a Practical Argument," by the Rev. H. P. Bull, S.S.J.E., *Church Times*, January 26, 1917 (reprinted by A. R. Mowbray.

curiously overlooks the fact which is made quite clear in the Bishop of Oxford's letter to his diocese, that the very reason for his insisting on a carefully guarded policy was due to the necessity for making it easy for many to whom reservation, in any shape or form, meant a great concession and advance. The Evangelicals are certainly to be reckoned amongst "the most spiritual and devotional forces in our Church." And we should do well to remember Archbishop Benson's quaint quotation: "Except these abide in the ship ye cannot be saved."

But it ought to be made quite clear that the shrinking from extra-liturgical devotions does not only come from them, but from many who place the highest possible value on the Eucharistic sacrifice and presence. It is not because we "dislike or disbelieve in the doctrine of the Real Presence," as has been most unfairly assumed, though how that language can be used of men like Dr. Gore or Dr. Talbot it is difficult to understand. There are many of us who say mass as often as we can, because we find there the very centre of our faith and the main support of our spiritual life, who yet feel that all experience goes to show that this type of devotion is the worst enemy that the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Eucharist has to meet. We are strongly in favour of reservation for the sick, because it is a practice which has Catholic consent, and because, too, we have proved the need for it in our ministry. We know that the original purpose of official reservation was practical, and we know that even in the West no other purpose came

in view for a thousand years and more. We know, too, that "the development of any *cultus* of the reserved Eucharist was the direct outcome of the acceptance of the doctrine of transubstantiation as the orthodox belief." [1]

What that doctrine of transubstantiation meant we can see from the popular demands to be found in fifteenth and sixteenth century literature, that people should be allowed to "see their Maker every day." That it leads to a strange and maimed theology may be illustrated by the assertion of the Bishop of London that "the tide of human grief and anxiety has been too great, the longing to get *as near as possible* [2] to the Sacramental Presence of Our Lord has been too urgent."

It is not a far cry to that view of the being of God which is revealed in an experience of another friend of mine, this time in France. She accompanied a friend and her children into a church. On getting inside the lady looked round to see where the Eucharist was reserved, and, not finding it, exclaimed, "Le bon Dieu n'est pas ici," and swept her children out to find some church where "le bon Dieu" was.

For these reasons, then, I welcome the bishops' attitude. But I would venture to suggest that something beyond the enunciation of general principles is required. Detailed requirements as to the mode and place of reservation are really necessary.

[1] Cf. Freestone, *The Sacrament Reserved*, xxi, p. 266. Alcuin Club Collections.

[2] The italics are mine.

It has apparently been suggested by some that the sacristy or some inaccessible chapel should be the place. But certain important considerations tell against either solution. With regard to the latter the difficulty is that such a chapel only exists in a small minority of churches. With regard to the former, though there is nothing uncatholic about the proposal, it may be urged that it will either seem to savour of irreverence, or lead to making the sacristy a more holy place than the church itself. There is a great deal to be said, as always, for the old traditional way, which our own laws suggest: either *i. e.* in a hanging pyx, between earth and heaven, or, probably better still, in an aumbry in the north or south wall of the chancel. In either case it will be in association with, though never on, the main altar.

Indeed, it should never be on an altar at all, if we are to preserve our sense of proportion. Those who have been present at mass when the Sacrament is exposed will have seen in an extreme form the difficulties it creates. If the Sacrament being reserved in this way leads some people to find comfort in their prayers from the knowledge that it is in the church, no great harm will be done, so long as all organised devotions before the place of reservation are strongly discouraged.

The whole discussion makes one realise the great loss we have sustained through the modern insane rage against chancel screens and the Jesuit fashion of "open" churches.

The need that emerges most clearly, however,

from this controversy is for an overhauling of our eucharistic theology. We might then discover that there is no "virtue" in the reserved species save for the purpose for which they are reserved—*i. e.* Communion.

The deeper need, often referred to in these pages, stands out more clearly than ever. The suspicions and misunderstandings which the controversy has engendered throw into high relief the lack of moral authority possessed by the bench of bishops. It is the mistakes of their predecessors that are mainly responsible for its absence. The only way towards its recovery is the formation of a Church Parliament, where frank discussion shall lead to the expression of a common mind. Then we can get ordered liberty.

NOTES

NOTES

The Question of Incense.

(p. 42)

The judgment on incense was a turning-point, as we can see more easily now than then. It lost the *Guardian* Mr. Lathbury, with all the consequences that have flowed from that mistake.

Note to Chapter III.

(p. 58)

"We ought to deplore the loss of unity which the Reformation involved." That this is not only the view of extreme "Catholics" the following quotation will show—

"Christendom was destined to break up into the nations of Europe. If anyone says that this disruption was all for the best —that what had to be is that which ought to be—I would not quarrel with what I cannot presume either to affirm or deny. But if we reflect on the beauty, the majesty, the potentialities of that which the word Christendom embodied; if we realise that the conception of the reign of God upon earth was the ideal to which men did homage in their hearts—however much their conduct fell short of their ideal, as conduct now falls short and will do in all ages—if, moreover, we weigh and measure by what cruel blows, by what wanton disillusioning, they were forced to loosen their clinging hold and even to ask in stupefaction the question whether God's vicar could be doing Satan's work, whether he could be the Anti-Christ, then we may turn and meet the problem whether it has been for the good of mankind that the Reformation which had to come should come as a Revolution, that the Church of saints and martyrs, of missioners and crusaders, should be dragged through the ruin of Avignon and bound to the chariot wheels of contemptible Italian dynasties,

should become 'an example of all the shames and infamies in the world,' as one of its greatest servants called it."[1]

The passage also indicates where the responsibility for the loss of union lay.

The meaning of catholicism, according to the Anglican Divines, is well brought out by Bramhall: "To sum up all that hath been said; whosoever doth preserve his obedience entire to the universal Church, and its representative, a general Council, and to all his superiors in their due order, so far as by law he is obliged; who holds an internal communion with all Christians, and an external communion so far as he can with a good conscience; who approves no reformation but that which is made by lawful authority, upon sufficient grounds with due moderation; who derives his Christianity by the uninterrupted line of Apostolical succession; who contents himself with his proper place in the ecclesiastical body; who disbelieves nothing contained in Holy Scripture, and if he hold any errors unwittingly and unwillingly, doth implicitly renounce them by his fuller and more firm adherence to that infallible rule; who believeth and practiseth all those credenda and agenda, which the universal Church spread over the face of the earth doth unanimously believe and practise as necessary to salvation, without condemning or censuring others of different judgment from himself in inferior questions, without obtruding his own opinions upon others as articles of Faith; who is implicitly prepared to believe and do all other speculative and practical truths, when they shall be revealed to him; and, in sum, 'qui sententiam diversae opinionis vinculo non praeponit unitatis'—'that prefers not a subtlety or an imaginary truth before the bond of peace;' he may securely say, 'My name is Christian, my surname is Catholic.'"[2]

Note on the Papacy before the Bar of History.

(p. 58)

Nothing stronger has ever been said than the language employed by Dollinger, who believed firmly in the Roman Primacy. "If the Primacy is, on the one hand, a source of strength to the Catholic Church, yet on the other hand it cannot be denied that

[1] A. L. Smith, *Church and State in the Middle Ages*, p. 135.

[2] Bramhall, vol. i, pp. 111, 112.

when one looks at it from the standpoint of the ancient Church —from the Apostolic Age till about 845—the Papacy, such as it has become, presents the appearance of a disfiguring, sickly, and choking excrescence on the organisation of the Church, hindering and decomposing the action of its vital powers, and bringing manifold diseases in its train."—*The Pope and the Council*, by Janus, p. xix. Rivingtons, 1869.

Note on the Kinship of the English and Eastern Churches.

(p. 62)

"The Grecian and all other Eastern Churches . . . never acknowledged any obedience to be due from them to the Bishop of Rome, but only an honourable respect, as to the prime Patriarch and 'beginning of unity.' Whose farewell or separation is said to have been as smart as ours and upon the same grounds, in these words: 'we acknowledge thy power, we cannot satisfy thy covetuousness, live by yourselves.'"—Bramhall, vol. i, p. 200.

The same recognition is to be found in Alexander Knox, at the beginning of the nineteenth century.

Note on the Ultramontane Theory.

(p. 82)

This is the view set forth, *e. g.* in the stimulating and ingenious book of Soloviev from which I have quoted at the head of this chapter. But he only succeeds in maintaining his philosophy by doing violence to history, and indeed at times by mistranslating the Fathers. These faults need not blind us to the truths the book contains—its appreciation of the sacerdotal element in religion, its mystical vision, and its passionate desire for unity.

Note on Chapter IV.

(p. 84)

On the Lutheran method of assurance Troeltsch is interesting: "If to the Catholic it was precisely the external authority and the substantiality of grace which seemed to guarantee salvation, for Luther's feeling it was just that authority which was uncertain

and alien, and that substantiality which was unintelligible and elusive. He needed for the personal life something purely personal. The means therefore was faith, *sola fides*, the affirmation, by the complete surrender of the soul to it, of that thought of God which has been made clear and intelligible to us in Christ. That is the end of priesthood and hierarchy, the sacramental communication of ethico-religious powers after the manner of a sensible substance, and the ascetic withdrawal from the world, with its special merits."—Troeltsch, *Protestantism and Progress*, p. 192. London, 1912.

Note on the Absence of Doctrinal Significance in the Traditional Vesture of the Clergy.

(p. 121)

The point is well illustrated in that mine of information about religion in old England, Canon Dalton's *Collegiate Church of Ottery St. Mary*, p. 195. Pitt Press, 1917.

"The dress of the clergy even at Mass was originally identical with the dress of a Roman civilian of the time who had some position. No distinctive vestment as to shape was set apart for exclusive use of the Christian minister, even in the most solemn part of divine worship, during at least the first four centuries of the Christian era. What was worn was, however, always to be fair and comely, not mean or sordid. Then as the old cut gradually passed out of use in the world it was retained in the churches. . . . From the historical standpoint, then, the Eucharistic vestments are one of the most valuable heirlooms that the Church possesses : that they are retained and used by the whole of Catholic Christendom, East and West, is a public external witness to the age, continuity and universality of the Church : it is their natural origin which gives them their real value. Clergy still stand at the altar in the same habit as they did at the beginning, in the costume which St. Paul (2 Tim. iv. 13 ; Acts xx. 7) and the other apostles wore as citizens of the world-wide Roman empire. The chasuble may thus be regarded as a visible token of the inherent unity of the Church and of the universality of her mission."

"A Modest and Distinct Song."

(p. 122)

Perhaps if that were carried out the great cathedral of London might find time to sing the Litany between Matins and

the Eucharist, as ordered in the Prayer book, at any rate in time of war. Reckless defiance of authority has been carried even further at Lincoln, where, the Litany having been dropped "for want of time," a second sermon has been inserted at Matins.

(p. 127)

Note to "stubbornness of things." The phrase was used by the Master of the Temple in my hearing.

NOTE ON THE WORDS, "A CLEAR EXAMPLE OF SOMETHING WHICH CANNOT BE HELD TO BE CATHOLIC."

(p. 132)

As a matter of fact, thoughtful Roman writers do not claim that these practices are, strictly speaking, Catholic. S. J. S., in *The Month* for March 1917, says: "Of course, it is the case that this practice of reserving for purposes of adoration is comparatively modern even in our own Church, and is still not in use in the Orthodox Church in the East. It is not, therefore, an essential element in Catholic worship."

He goes on to object to Dr. Gore's article in the *English Church Review* for February. "Could anyone who holds the doctrine of the Real Presence argue like that?" But he proceeds to show how truly the Bishop has described the current Roman teaching as to that Presence. "Of course, to have Him in our hearts in Holy Communion is more in itself than to have Him near to us in the tabernacle. But we have Him in Holy Communion *only for a few minutes at a time*, and in proportion as we believe this and take it to heart is our desire to seek His Presence in the tabernacle again and again." That is to say, the practice of visiting the tabernacle depends upon a doctrine of Communion which is itself a doctrine of visits. It does not flow so readily from a doctrine of incorporation such as seems to be implied in the prayer that "He may dwell in us and we in Him." But unfortunately *Hymns Ancient and Modern*, by including just the most Roman verses of Faber's well-known hymn, has had a greater influence on popular theology than the words of the Prayer-Book. We should do better to go back to Hooker, and believe with St. Paul and St. John that "in him even according to his manhood we, according to our heavenly being, are as branches in that root out of which they grew" (*Eccl. Pol.*, 5. 56. 7). Behind it all, of course, lies a true and "high" doctrine of baptism.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
RICHARD CLAY & SONS, LIMITED,
BRUNSWICK ST., STAMFORD ST., S.E.,
AND BUNGAY, SUFFOLK.